



ANNUAL MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCESSES July 2018

Authors:
Paula Ainsworth, Assistant Registrar
Alison Mullan, Head of ASQ

Approved by ASQC, 16 July 2018

Contents

1. Context.....	1.....
2. Processes.....	1.....
2.1. Programme Approval.....	1.....
2.2. Annual Programme Review.....	2.....
2.3. Strategic Teaching and Learning Review.....

2.2. Annual Programme Review

3. Appendices

3.1.

Where a PSRB has required changes made to be made

3.2. Annual Programme Review Process

3.2.1. Annual Programme Review Guidelines

3.2.1.1. Context

Annual Programme Review (APR) provides a valuable opportunity to reflect on a programme—or cognate suite of programmes—to ensure that there is a focus on the overall student experience, including in any minor.

3.2.1.3. Reporting

The process has been designed to be predominantly for ~~looking~~ acknowledging the performance of the previous academic year, identifying good practice and building on these foundations.

3.2.2. Supplementary Questions

SECTION 1: SPECIFIED	
APR Questions:	Supplementary Questions/Prompts:

are any issues being
addressed?

recognising the diverse experiences and needs

or resource requests will help address them in future years?

- x if sufficient and appropriate learning resources are available to all students, including where students have documented study/support needs. In particular, are the required reading materials for the course available in the library?
- x are there any timetabling issues or challenges which have an impact on teaching, learning and/or assessment?
- x for joint/combined programmes, if there is there an appropriate structure to manage and administer the programme across departments/faculties, with an identified academic and administrative lead and shared programme team approach to regular cohort meetings and the annual monitoring and review of the programme.
- x how students' transition to higher education (in the UK) can be supported, with students prepared for the teaching, learning and assessment methods to be used in the programme, so that such methods are not unfamiliar at the point at which students are summatively assessed, and that the programme gives an early opportunity for students to experience these methods.
- x if there is an appropriate strategy for academic and pastoral support which meets the University's and the programme's requirements and fulfils students' needs.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">x if academic staff satisfaction of teaching or marking and assessment has changedx if the level of academic staff engagement in the use of technology has increased |
|--|---|

areas of enhancement can be identified? Are there any factors outside the programme team's control which are affecting performance indicators, positively or negatively? Is there any support which could be provided at department, faculty or university level which could help with this? What support would this be?

In particular the programme team should reflect on performance in the following areas:

- x admission numbers, entry qualifications, relevant characteristics of the cohort (including any admissions through access, articulation, exchange or study abroad agreements, where available)
- x progression between years (failure rates, retention, module, programme level averages)
- x final award outcomes of students
- x graduated destinations
- x particular improvements in areas of the programme

<p>the programme team's reflections above, what are the top 3 priorities relating to the programme or suite of programmes in the next 12 months</p>	<p>process, including the three priorities, should be listed in Rolling Action Plan which accompanies the APR report.</p>
---	---

SECTION 4: COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS

APR Questions:	Supplementary Questions/Prompts:
----------------	----------------------------------

<p>Where collaborative partnerships exist (other than the designated RTPs or ITPs), is the programme team confident;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the arrangements in place to manage the partnership are secure and working well b) That the arrangements for managing the programme are secure and equivalent to those of a programme delivered at Lancaster c) That the partner is delivering a programme equivalent to the quality and standards of a Lancaster degree delivered at Bailrigg d) That the student experience is of a standard equivalent to that of a student studying at Bailrigg 	<p>By 'collaborative partners' we specifically mean any programmes of study which lead to a Lancaster degree (notwithstanding the award offered by the partner) which Lancaster may contribute only part of the teaching, or none at all, but for which Lancaster retains oversight for the quality and standards of the provision. The programme team may wish to consider the following in relation to each point a)– d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) For example, are there effective lines of communication which are open and transparent, and is the partnership resourced appropriately with staff identified for key roles and responsibilities? b) For example the arrangements for marketing, recruitment and admissions, entry requirements, provision of resources, marking and feedback, assessment and award, monitoring and review etc. c) Is there evidence that the partner has processes for the monitoring and review of programmes, modules, teaching and/or learning (including revisions to programmes and modules) to which Lancaster has the opportunity to contribute, that the arrangements for marking and moderation are robust, equitable and fair, that the admissions criteria are appropriate for the level of the award and the process for admitting students commensurate with that of the line department? d) Is there evidence that student satisfaction is at acceptable level or higher, that sufficient and appropriate resources and facilities are available to students, and that feedback and support is available such that students are able to achieve learning outcomes.
---	--

SECTION 5: POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRAMMES	
APR Questions:	Supplementary Questions/Prompts:
a) Which aspects of the PGR student experience have been of particular note (strengths and/or challenges) in the past year?	<p>This could include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Induction and support x quality and frequency of supervision; x the sense of being part of an academic community; x annual progression rates; x percentage of successful outcomes (e.g. pass without referral) though you do not need to summarise all completion data as it will be available in the data packs; x improvements as a response to student feedback; x employability, training and development and other student-focused activities. <p>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.</p>
b) Have any i) new PGR programmes, ii) PGR programme changes, or iii) PGR organisational changes been implemented this year? If so, what successes and challenges have you faced?	<p>For example these could include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) distance learning, partnerships, or DTPs, ii) changes to taught elements, progression requirements, thesis format, iii) changes to student representation in decision making, programme directors, or administrative support.
c) Are there any further PGR programme or student experience issues or strengths that the programme team wishes to raise? In particular, are there any examples of effective practice which might benefit others by being shared?	<p>For example this may include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x accommodation of facilities x access to training or conferences x entrant quality or quantity x implementation of policy or regulation
d) Looking forward, what are the top 3 priorities for the programme team relating to the student experience of PGR students or the academic quality of PGR programmes in the next 12 months?	<p>These three priorities are those actions identified through the review process which the Programme team believe are critical to maintain and/or enhance the quality of the student experience. All actions identified through the review process, including the three priorities, should be listed in the Rolling Action Plan which accompanies the APR report.</p>

3.2.3. Faculty APR Template

a) What trends or patterns can be identified from the Programme APR reports in relation to programme design/re-design?
b) What evidence is there that programme teams have responded, or will respond, to the thrusts of the Education Strategy?
c) What evidence is there of innovations in teaching, learning and/or assessment, particularly with the use of digital enablers, within Programme APR reports?
d) What resourcing issues were identified in the Programme APR reports that require escalation to institutional level? Please provide a summary.
e) From the data provided, to what extent does the faculty have confidence that programmes are performing in line with the benchmark data for the faculty and/or comparator institutions? Please note any anomalies including any associated mitigating actions.
f) What issues, if any, have been raised by External Examiners this year, and have these been acknowledged and addressed in the relevant Programme APR reports? Have any issues been escalated to faculty level, or require escalation to institutional level?

3.2.4. Annual Monitoring Process Indicative Timeline

