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**POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMME ANNUAL REVIEW**

**Collaborative Provision**

Introduction

1. The Programme Annual Review (PAR) for taught programmes (both validated and franchised) is an important part of the University’s quality assurance processes. The PAR is an evaluation of a programme(s) over an academic year involving careful reading and evaluation of evidence and identifying areas for improvement based on that evidence. The PAR should be a reflective process for the programme team(s), providing analysis of past performance and the development and implementation of evidence-based action plans for the future. The evaluation must draw upon programme data and the evidence should include:
* Key student data on teaching and learning quality, including: comparison across sites, if applicable to your institution; where applicable, multiple cohorts each academic year, where results have gone through an examination board.
* Changes to the curriculum
* External examiner reports and responses
* Trend data on the destinations of leavers from higher education
* Student module evaluation surveys
* Any other internal surveys from your institution
* Outcomes of Periodic Review

Internal and external reference points:

* Where applicable, Learning and Teaching Strategy for your institution, other institutional strategies and policies including your Employability Strategy, and Diversity and Equal Opportunities Policy
* External reports (where appropriate, e.g. reports from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs)) and other external reference points (e.g. UK Subject Benchmark Statements)
1. For the University, this process provides assurance that an academic review is taking place, and an opportunity to intervene in programme-specific issues where necessary. Immediate operational issues should be referred to line managers.

PAR report template

3. The PAR report comprises four sections:

* Programme summary – to put the report into context, for example, if this is the first year of the programme, whether it has undergone periodic review, whether any innovative practices have been introduced and an assessment of them, programme strengths and weaknesses.
* Key priorities from the previous academic year – monitoring progress of actions identified in the previous year
* Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan – highlighting key priorities or issues to address
* Curriculum changes – that have been made in the year under consideration, or in the previous year and their impact during the year under consideration, or changes which are under discussion for the following year.

The LTQG scrutiny report is part of the PAR report and should be completed by the academic department LTQG Chair. If LTQG requires changes to the report, these need to be signed off by the LTQG Chair before the report is submitted to the Academic Office.

1. The Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan is a live document that should be a standing item at every meeting of the Programme Board to ensure actions are followed up. Matters raised by student representatives on Programme Boards should be incorporated into the plan, as appropriate. By using performance indicators, the plan should address the core university issues around teaching excellence, student satisfaction, retention and graduate progression, including by different student groups. Following submission of the final PAR report any completed actions should be removed from the Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan.

Completion and approval of PAR report

1. Programme teams should hold a PAR planning meeting following the final Programme Examinations Board of the year. The team will evaluate the previous academic year, using the data provided and review the existing Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan and determine what improvements need to be considered.Areas that must be addressed within the Plan are as follows:
* Provision for disabled students
* Provision for black and minority ethnic (BAME) students (if applicable at your institution)
* Non-continuation
* Attainment and progression
* Graduate employment and further study
* Key student data on the quality of the teaching and learning opportunities (eg. distribution of awards, Module attendance and failure rates)

The report should comment upon:

* How programme teams ensure that the programme is attractive and continues to meet the needs of students
* Recruitment – application and enrolment data
* Curriculum design and how the programme is delivered in a way that is sustainable
1. The draft PAR report will then go through a scrutiny process at an extraordinary meeting of the LTQG, or subgroup of it. This should take place in early January but can be before, and the outcomes recorded on the PAR LTQG scrutiny report. This scrutiny process should assess the evaluation of the data and the conclusions being drawn, including highlighting any factual inconsistencies in the document or possible typographical errors. Teams should ensure that, where required, revisions are made to the report and they are signed off by the LTQG Chair on the scrutiny form before it is submitted to the Academic Office. Where there are considerations for the University, these need to be noted in the scrutiny form and approved by LTQG.
2. The final, revised version of the PAR report must be submitted to the Academic Office by early February and will be considered by a University PAR Panel, chaired by the Deputy Provost: Learning and Teaching, in March. The Programme Convener (and/or Roehampton Link Tutor ) will be invited along to this meeting in slots allocated by School/Department. A PAR summary report will be produced subsequently which will be submitted to Roehampton’s Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.
3. Collaborative partners are expected to complete a PAR report for both validated and franchised taught programmes. The Link Tutor is considered to be part of the programme team and should contribute to the writing of the PAR report, but not to its scrutiny. The Collaborative PAR reports will go through the same scrutiny process as internal programmes.
4. Postgraduate PAR Cycle Schedule

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| November | Programme Board (review final progression and attainment data, enrolment/tariff entry points)Update Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan |
| November/December | PAR planning meeting (review progression and attainment data, destinations of leavers from higher education, EE report) |
| November to January | Drafting of PAR report  |
| January | LTQG scrutiny of draft PAR report  |
| By early February March | Submission of final PAR report (including annexes) to Academic OfficeUniversity PAR Panel  |
| March/April | Programme Board (review Semester 1 Module Evaluation data)Update Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan |
| May | Programme Board (review Semester 2 Module Evaluation data)Update Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan |
| May | LTQC approve PAR report summary |
|  |  |

1. See Annex A for the Programme Annual Review cycle.
2. See Annex B for the PAR report template

Further information on Quality Assurance at the University of Roehampton can be found at <https://www.roehampton.ac.uk/corporate-information/quality-and-standards/collaborative-partners/>
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**Annex B**

**UNIVERSITY OF ROEHAMPTON**

**Postgraduate Programme Annual Review Report (Collaborative Partners)**

Programme Annual Review (PAR) for taught programmes is the cornerstone of the University’s quality assurance processes. It is an evaluation of a programme(s) following a review of evidence including External Examiner reports, student achievement data, key student data on teaching and learning quality (see Guidance, Section 5), Destination of leavers from Higher Education and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports. The PAR should be a self-reflective process for the Programme Team(s), providing analysis of past performance and the development and implementation of evidence-based action plans for the future. Where an institution has multiple sites, the PAR should reflect on and compare performance across sites. Data sources should be referenced where appropriate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Year:** |  |
| **Programme(s):** |  |
| **Academic department:** |  |
| **Collaborative Partner (if applicable)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Programme Summary** [Max. 500 words]

The section should expand on issues/items identified in the Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan (No. 3 below) and comment on achievements, enhancements and areas for improvement. Data sets can be included to support the commentary. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Key priorities from the previous academic year taken from the previous year’s PAR report**
 |
| **Priority** | **Actions** | **Progress** | **Completed/ongoing** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan**

The Standards, Quality and Enhancement Plan should highlight key issues or areas to be addressed across the programme. It is a live document which should be considered at each Programme Board and updated as appropriate throughout the year. It should therefore include any actions that are outstanding from previous annual monitoring cycles. For PAR reports covering a programme cluster, actions relating to individual programmes must be flagged where appropriate. The following areas may be considered: programme management; curriculum design and content; teaching, learning and assessment; student recruitment and admissions; student retention, progression and achievement; learning resources and student support; comparison across different sites (where applicable).  |
| **Student success** Non-continuation, academic achievement, analysis by subgroups e.g. BAME [Black and Minority Ethnic students])  |
| **Priority** | **Action** | **Responsibility** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Quality of teaching** Evidence base including progression and attainment data, key student data on teaching and learning quality.  |
| **Priority** | **Action** | **Responsibility** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Graduate employment and further study** Destination of leavers from HE (DLHE) |
| **Priority** | **Action** | **Responsibility** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Quality and standards** Evidence base including progression and attainment data, external examiner reports  |
| **Priority** | **Action** | **Responsibility** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student recruitment**Evidence base including applications, enrolments, tariff entry |
| **Priority** | **Action** | **Responsibility** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Curriculum changes**

This section should summarise modifications and curriculum developments to the programme. Comment on the changes made to the programme which have been implemented in the academic year under consideration, detailing why they were made and if they were successful. This section should also comment on curriculum changes proposed, either as part of modification or periodic review, for the following academic year. |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Programme Convener**  |  |
| **Programme Convener signature** |  |
| **Date** |  |
| **Head of Department/School (or nominee)**  |  |
| **Head of Department/School (or nominee)signature** |  |
| **Date** |  |

 **Postgraduate Programme Annual Review (PAR) LTQG Scrutiny Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Year:** |  |
| **Programme(s):** |  |
| **Academic department:** |  |
| **Collaborative Partner (if applicable)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Identify any key issues that should be considered by the University PAR Panel  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Where innovative approaches to learning and teaching or research have been identified, examples should be provided |
|  |

 Yes No N/A

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Has the programme team fully reported on progress against last year’s priorities? |   |  |  |
| Does the Quality, Standards and Enhancement plan have targeted objectives that have been identified as a result of the review? |  |  |  |
| Has the programme team used and referenced the full range of the evidence base available? (Programme performance data, external examiner reports, student achievement data, Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reports) |  |  |  |
| Is there evidence that the programme team has addressed the core university issues around teaching excellence in particular student satisfaction, retention and graduate progression? |  |  |  |
| Is there sufficient evidence of the student and graduate voice? |  |  |  |
| Has the programme team referenced sector benchmarks for equivalent programmes? |  |  |  |
| Has the programme team responded to PSRBs requirements where appropriate? |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Where ‘no’ has been indicated above, additional commentary should be provided  |
|  |

**The programme convener is required to make any requested updates as indicated on the scrutiny report, prior to sign off by the LTQG Chair/Scrutineer and submission to the Academic Office**

|  |
| --- |
| LTQG Chair/Scrutineer’s name:   |
| LTQG Chair/Scrutineer’s signature:  |
| Date: |