

QUALITY REVIEW AND ENHANCEMENT FRAMEWORK

Chapter 2 - Quality Review and Enhancement of Taught Programmes

2. Quality Review and Enhancement of Taught Programmes

Appropriate datasets to consider when undertaking activities within this Chapter include, but are not limited to:

- National Student Survey data (including qualitative comments and demographic splits).
- Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).
- Other student feedback (end-of-module and mid-module feedback from: surveys, focus groups, discussion boards, clickers, etc).
- Student achievement and progression data.
- Comparative performance data (e.g., previous years and student achievement on other modules).
- Feedback from Student Voice Partnership meetings.
- Feedback from 'Town Hall', 'Big Rep' or equivalent meetings with students.
- Other outputs from student engagement e.g. Student Voice Partnership outputs.
- Peer dialogue feedback.
- External Examiner reports.
- Reports from partner institutions/organisations and placement providers (if appropriate).
- Reports from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) (if appropriate).
- UG/PGT Quality Review dashboard data.
- Progression.
- Student achievement and progression data (Module Results Report, SITS).
- Employability/Graduate Outcomes.
- Degree Classifications.
- Attendance and Engagement.
- Support and staff development.
- Good practice gathered.
- Annual Module Review (AMR) forms.

- Teaching Excellence Action Plans (TEAPs) from previous years, or draft TEAPs in-progress.
- Teaching Excellence Monitoring (TEM) notes from previous years.

Many datasets are available in the University's [MI Hub SharePoint Site](#). This includes the Quality Review and Enhancement Dashboards listed above. Please note, staff may need to use the Virtual Private Network (VPN) to access these.

2.1 Annual Module Review

The AMR process is undertaken by the Module Convenor/Lead (or equivalent) and then scrutinised by the Programme Director (or equivalent). This annual process of review should be initiated and co-ordinated by the Module Convenor/Lead (or equivalent) and involve all contributors to the module, making use of available data and feedback.

Faculties are provided with a template AMR Form, which can be adapted to local needs e.g., PSRB requirements. Use of this particular form is not mandatory; Faculties may use other versions as appropriate, e.g., forms, and SharePoint mechanisms. The AMR template can be accessed on the [Quality Review and Enhancement SharePoint Site](#). Please contact [Education Policy, Quality and Standards](#) if you require permission to access this site.

The timing and approach taken to AMR, to ensure the quality review and enhancement of modules, is at the discretion of the Faculty (or delegated School).

As part of the AMR process, the available data and feedback should be used to consider the appropriateness of the module's stated aims and intended learning outcomes; teaching methods; assessment design; assessment and feedback strategies; specialist and generic skills development; and resources provision.

AMR is a local-level academic tool for self-reflection on a module's delivery and outcomes for students, and aids the consideration of improvements and enhancements, which can then feed into further centrally led Quality Review processes (such as TEAPs).

2.1.2 Output

The output of the AMR process will usually be:

- An AMR Form for each module detailing short- and long-term developmental actions, to be shared with students and other relevant stakeholders.

2.2 Scrutiny of the Outputs of the Annual Module Review Process by the Programme Director (or equivalent)

Following completion of the AMR Form, Programme Directors (or equivalent) summarise the outcomes of the AMR process in their areas, to highlight best practice and identify areas of concern requiring review and development.

This summary by the Programme Director (or equivalent) will be drawn upon by the Director of Education and Student Experience, to draft their annual Department TEAP. It is suggested that scrutiny of the outcomes of this process should occur as part of Programme/Department education meetings, teaching and learning away days, or an equivalent forum for review and development discussions. The timing and format of such meetings are at the discretion of the Faculty.

2.2.1 Output

The output from the scrutiny of the AMR process by the Programme Director (or equivalent) will usually be:

- A summary of the AMR process in their areas, to highlight best practice and identify areas of concern requiring review and development, which can then feed into the Department TEAP.

2.3 Department Teaching Excellence Action Plan

Further information regarding Teaching Excellence Action Plans (TEAPs), such as relevant timelines, datasets, and guidance, can be accessed on the [Quality Review and Enhancement SharePoint Site](#). Please contact [Education Policy, Quality and Standards](#) if you require permission to access this site.

Directors of Education and Student Experience (DESE) are responsible for their Department's TEAP and should identify actions/responsibilities to allocate to themselves and other staff. In some cases, it may be merited to develop separate TEAPs at UG and PGT level, for specific programmes, or groups of programmes, at the discretion of the Directors of Education and Student Experience (or equivalent).

TEAPs, or a summary of the key actions, **should** be shared with, and approved by student representatives (e.g., through Student Voice Partnerships), so that they become co-created student/staff action planning documents.

Departments and Faculties should continue to review and update their Teaching Excellence Action Plan throughout the year and when new data becomes available during a cycle.

For **online programmes**:

- The Department's (or Subject/Programme) **should** be augmented by facilitated online discussions for each module which will provide additional, or alternative, evidence to feed into the TEAP/TEM process.
- They should also include actions which relate to online programmes within their TEAP. Where an online programme is in the process of approval, the TEAP **should** indicate this and include information about the expected timeline for approval/implementation.

For programmes delivered and assessed through **Validation Partnerships** and awarded by the University:

- A Partner Institution-level TEAP **should** be completed by a senior representative of the institution.
- The TEAP should encompass all programme delivered by the Partner Institution under the terms of the Validation Partnership.
- The Partnership Institution **should** use the TEAP to evidence how it is aligning itself with the University's priorities for taught programmes, as well as communicating planned local, institutional level developments and actions to enhance the quality of the student experience.

2.3.1 Output

The output from the DESE (or equivalent) after reviewing the summary of the module review process produced by Programme Directors (or equivalent) and any additional data will usually be:

- A draft Department (or institution) TEAP.

2.4 Annual Review of Departments by the Faculty

Further information regarding TEAP and Faculty scrutiny, such as relevant timelines, datasets, and guidance, can be accessed on the [Quality Review and Enhancement SharePoint Site](#). Please contact [Education Policy, Quality and Standards](#) if you require permission to access this site.

Department TEAPs will undergo Faculty scrutiny via TEM meetings. Prior to this, it is recommended that Faculties should run Annual Review of Department meetings, reviewing the status of existing actions, monitoring the efficacy of completed actions, and agreeing on new actions to be put in place for the next academic year.

DESE (or Programme Directors/ equivalent, where appropriate within the Faculty) should present their Department (or Programme/Subject) TEAP to a Faculty audience

for scrutiny. For Institutional-level TEAPs developed by Validation Partners, this scrutiny will take place during Partnership Board meetings or equivalent.

2.4.1 Membership

These meetings should usually be chaired by the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education (APVCE) with the following suggested membership:

- Senior Education Partner
- DESE/Programme Directors (or equivalent).
- Other Department-level education leaders as required.
- Student representatives from both Streatham and Penryn campuses.

2.4.2 Agenda

The agenda may include:

- Presentations by the DESE/Programme Director (or equivalent).
- Discussion of outstanding actions from the previous year(s).
- Consideration of the draft TEAPs.
- Patterns/themes arising from TEAPs.
- Discussion of priorities for the year ahead.
- Curriculum development.
- Discussion of data, particularly the Office for Students's B3 Student Outcomes data.

2.4.3 Output

The outputs will usually be:

- Department TEAPs (it is suggested that these are reviewed at relevant Faculty meetings on an on-going basis).

2.5 Annual Review of Departments by the University: Teaching Excellence Monitoring meetings

The TEM meetings are the annual University review meeting with each Department (or Subject/Programme, as appropriate within the Faculty).

TEM meetings will also take place with Validation Partner Institutions.

TEAPs are reviewed at the University-level and feedback is given for revisions and sharing of best practice.

2.5.1 Membership

These meetings are chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) with the following suggested membership:

- Dean for Taught Students (or Associate Dean for Taught Students as nominee).
- APVCE (and Associate Dean for Education in the Business School and Associate Dean for Medical Education).
- Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Executive Dean (or Deputy).
- Head of Department.
- DESE/Programme Director (or equivalent).
- Director of Teaching Excellence and Enhancement (or Head of Education Policy, Quality and Standards as nominee).
- Senior Education Partner (or Deputy Education Partner as nominee).
- Student Representative/s.
- Additional representatives including Senior Programme Quality Enhancement Advisors, Directors of Faculty Operations, etc.
- Department Manager for support for notetaking and capture of actions.
- Equivalent representatives from Validation Partner Institutions.

2.5.2 Agenda

The agenda may include presentations from DESE/Programme Director (or equivalent), or as appropriate, and discussions of:

- Department (or equivalent) TEAP.
- Links to the University's Education Strategy and the OfS's Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).
- Learning Community and Success for All Our Students.
- Student Experience.

- Student Outcomes.
- Valuing Educators.

2.5.3 Output

The outputs will usually be:

- Revised Department TEAP.

It is recommended Faculties run meetings to review outputs of the TEMs, the status of existing actions, monitoring of actions, etc.

For Institutional-level TEAPs developed by Validation Partners, this review will take place during Partnership Board meetings or equivalent.

2.6 Annual Review of Faculties by the University

Following completion of the TEM meetings, an annual review of the process and its outcomes should be undertaken by the University in collaboration with Faculties. Themes and patterns arising from TEAPs should be highlighted by Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and reviewed and discussed as a group.

Opportunities to inform the development of the University's Education Strategy and the need for new policies or projects may be identified at this point.

For online programmes, the University may also implement a thematic review of lessons learned from online programmes, to encourage good practice across the University, at the end of the TEAP/TEM meeting processes.

Lessons learned from programmes delivered and assessed through Validation Partnerships and awarded by the University, will also be shared to encourage good practice within and between such partnerships.

2.6.1 Membership

This meeting is chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) with the following suggested membership:

- Dean for Taught Students (or Associate Dean for Taught Students as nominee).
- APVCE (and Associate Dean for Education in the Business School and Associate Dean for Medical Education).
- Director of Teaching Excellence and Enhancement (or Head of Education Policy, Quality and Standards as nominee).
- Head of Library.
- Head of Student Employability and Success (SEAS).

- Business Manager to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience).
- Senior Education Partner (or Deputy Education Partner as nominee).
- Student Representative/s.

This meeting may take place via an existing forum, such as via the Education and Student Experience Executive Committee (EdSEEC).

2.6.2 Agenda

The agenda may include:

- Presentations by APVCEs (and Associate Dean for Education in the Business School and Associate Dean for Medical Education) summarising key themes and critical actions emerging from the process.

2.6.3 Output

The outputs will usually be:

- A University-level summary of the Teaching Excellence process.