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1. Introduction to annual review

1.1 Oxford Brookes is committed to excellence in the management of the academic programmes leading to its awards, wherever they are delivered. One of its four strategic goals (OBU Strategy 2020) is to be “a university that enables a student experience of the highest standard possible”, and the University’s Strategy for Enhancing the Student Experience sets out how this will be achieved. The annual review process aims to provide a framework both for the assurance of the quality and standards of the University’s awards, and to promote activities for enhancing the student experience; in line with the expectation set out in the UK Quality Code (Chapter B8, 2013) that “higher education providers, in discharging their responsibilities for setting and maintaining academic standards and assuring and enhancing the quality of learning opportunities, operate effective, regular and systematic processes for monitoring and for review”.

1.2 This chapter aims to be an accessible and comprehensive guide to procedural requirements for the annual review of taught programmes leading to Oxford Brookes awards, especially for:

- staff (in Faculties, Directorates and partner organisations) responsible for the quality management of academic provision;
- QAA review teams, professional bodies and other external quality agencies with an interest in the quality and standards of the University’s academic provision.

It covers all undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision leading to Oxford Brookes credit or awards, including programmes delivered through collaborative partnerships. Further information about monitoring arrangements for collaborative provision can be found in Chapter 5; and monitoring requirements for short courses can be found in Chapter 6, of the Quality & Standards Handbook.

1.3 The UK Quality Code for Higher Education underpins and informs the University’s framework for monitoring the academic standards and quality of its provision, emphasising the importance of annual programme monitoring in enabling institutions to “consider the effectiveness of the programme in achieving its stated aims and the success of students in attaining the intended learning outcomes”. The Code also highlights the key role of annual monitoring in enabling programme teams to take timely action to remedy any identified problems and to enhance the quality of their provision. The annual monitoring and review process is therefore an evidence-based process, drawing on a range of relevant qualitative evidence and also on data derived from the University's Academic Performance Reporting Tool (APTT) which provides reports on student performance at module, programme and faculty level, tailored to the requirements of annual review. The use of these reports is intended to enable academic staff and managers to easily identify issues affecting the learning experience that require action, and therefore to take timely action at the appropriate level to improve quality and standards. The process should also highlight areas of good practice and any scope for enhancement of approaches to learning, teaching and assessment.

1.4 It is recognised that programme monitoring is a continuous activity, managed by Programme Committees, that takes place throughout the year. The purpose of the annual reports at programme and Faculty level is to provide assurance to AESC of the quality and standards of the University’s academic awards, and to facilitate timely action at the appropriate level to remedy any shortcomings and enhance the quality of the student experience. Given that effective enhancement of the student experience at programme level may require action that is outside the scope of the Programme Lead’s authority, the annual monitoring and review process at Oxford Brookes involves participation at different levels of the institution. An important feature of the annual review process is that it should be evaluative, action-focused and forward-looking, and should promote discussion between key players, including:

- Programme team members
- Students
- Service users and other stakeholders
- Professional bodies
- Heads of Department/School
- Associate Deans (Student Experience)
- Faculty Executive Groups
• Faculty AESCs
• University AESC
• Directorates
2. **The annual review cycle**

*September-November*
Annual Programme Review reports (UG programmes) prepared by Programme Leads, including collaborative provision. ACP annual review meetings held in September.

*November-January*
Annual Programme Review reports (PGT programmes) prepared by Programme Leads, including collaborative provision.

*November-January*
Subject/Programme Committees hold annual review meetings – programme teams, in consultation with student representatives and any other relevant stakeholders, should agree on any proposed actions to address issues or enhance the provision.

*January-March*
Faculty Annual Review reports (home and collaborative provision) prepared by Associate Deans (Student Experience), for approval by Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committees. Heads of Department/School should provide FAESC with a short report to either assure the committee that all Programme Annual Review reports have been received, or describe any action being taken to remedy the situation where reports have not been submitted (this should be formally recorded in the minutes). FAESC should provide feedback to Programme Leads on action being/to be taken at Faculty level to address any issues raised in programme annual review reports. Issues outside the remit of FAESC, for example, those with resource implications - should be referred to Faculty Executive Groups.

*March-April*
Faculty Annual Review reports considered by AESC (home provision) and CPSC (collaborative provision). AESC/CPSC must be assured that the annual programme review process has been completed satisfactorily within each Faculty; the Committees will identify and prioritise any issues that have emerged for action at institutional level, and request responses from the relevant Directorates.

*May-July*
Faculty AESCs consider any themes that have arisen from the annual review cycle to inform their plans for enhancement. AESC/CPSC will consider the responses from Directorates to the issues raised in Faculty Annual Review reports.

*July-September*
ACP annual programme review reports prepared.

*September*
Annual Quality Review prepared by the Head of APQO for consideration by AESC. An update to the AQR is submitted to AESC in March to incorporate feedback from external examiners for PGT provision and collaborative provision, who are required to report later in the year.
3. **Annual programme review – ‘home’ provision**

3.1 The annual programme review process covers all undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision leading to an Oxford Brookes University award or credit. It is designed to enable Programme Leads, Subject Coordinators and Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committees to demonstrate how well their programmes meet sector, professional and institutional expectations for academic standards and the enhancement of the student learning experience.

3.2 An annual review report must be produced for each programme of study leading to a University award (including those delivered by distance learning or flying faculty). Where appropriate, a single report may be produced for a cluster of cognate programmes, but this must be agreed in advance with the Associate Dean (Student Experience). Where possible, credit-bearing short courses should be reported upon as part of the report on a programme or group of programmes in a related subject area.

3.3 The annual programme review process is evidence-based, and reports should be evaluative and focused on action to improve the student experience. In evaluating the success of their programmes, academic teams must draw on a range of quantitative and qualitative evidence, including student data, external examiners reports, feedback from students, internal QA reports, outcomes of the implementation of University initiatives, reports from PSRBs and other relevant external bodies, and, where relevant, feedback from alumni, employers and service users. The process of evaluation should also highlight areas of good practice in learning, teaching and assessment for further dissemination across the Department/School or Faculty.

3.4 Quantitative data on a range of performance indicators is provided via the APTT – the reporting template is automatically populated with the data relevant to the programme/s selected by the report author. The data is presented so as to enable Programme Leads to easily assess potential areas of risk to the provision, and therefore to take timely action to improve academic quality and standards. Guidance on how to extract Annual Review statistics from the Academic Performance Tracking Tool (APTT) can be found on the [SBPO web pages](mailto:). Training will be provided by colleagues in the Strategic & Business Planning Office for staff responsible for authoring annual programme review reports. Contact Georgina Spary, the Business Intelligence Manager, for details, on gspary@brookes.ac.uk

3.5 The format of the programme annual review report is intended to enable programme teams to link the performance of their provision with the University’s strategic objectives for quality enhancement and portfolio development, as well as to help them focus on the academic quality and standards issues relating to individual programmes. The template for annual programme review reports (T3.1 should be used for home provision) can be downloaded from the [APQO website](mailto:).

3.6 The following documents should be appended to the report:
- a copy of the action plan from the previous year’s annual review report, including an update on progress with each planned action;
- the external examiners’ report received during the academic year to which the report relates and a copy of any initial responses sent by the Programme Lead;
- the National Student Survey (NSS) action plan for the programme/s under review, if applicable.

3.7 Although the focus of the annual programme review process is primarily on academic quality and standards, issues relating to the quality of central support services may be raised by staff and students during the year. To enable timely and effective resolution of specific problems, any concerns about the quality of central service provision should be reported directly to Heads of Department or Associate Deans (Student Experience) for referral to the relevant Director. Any general themes relating to the provision of central support for learning may also be recorded in part 3.4 of the annual programme review report.
4. Annual programme review – collaborative provision

4.1 Reporting requirements for collaborative arrangements are similar to those for 'home' provision; however separate templates are available for use by collaborative partners. Template T3.2 should be used by members of the Associate College Partnership, and template T3.3 should be used by UK partner organisations who are not members of the ACP and by overseas partners. These templates are available via the link in paragraph 3.5 above. NOTE: Flying faculty arrangements are subject to the same monitoring requirements as for on-campus provision; and, where an articulation agreement is in place alongside a franchised or validated programme leading to a Brookes award, it should also be included in the annual programme review report for the provision as a whole.

4.2 APTT data is available only for collaborative arrangements in which the students are enrolled with the University as well as the partner organisation. Most non-ACP collaborative partnerships confer registered status on the students, and responsibility for keeping the data therefore lies with the partner organisation at which they are enrolled; however, annual review reports must still refer to the relevant data to evaluate the quality and standards of the programme/s concerned, and these statistics should be incorporated into the report.

4.3 Annual programme review is a self-evaluative exercise, and reports should therefore be completed primarily by the programme manager at the partner organisation. The Liaison Manager may need to provide advice on the information required, and should provide input into the report in a number of sections, where indicated, but they should not compromise the independence of their role by completing the whole report.

4.4 Annual programme review reports for collaborative provision should be considered by the Programme Committee, approved by Faculty AESC and, once approved, should be formally submitted to the APQO with the final Faculty Annual Review (Collaborative Provision), considered by AESC’s Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (see section 5 below).
5. **Faculty Annual Review**

5.1 From the 2014-15 reporting cycle, the Faculty Annual Review report is split into two parts so as to be able to report on home provision to the Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, and on collaborative provision to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (established in February 2015). The Faculty overview of collaborative provision may also be used to provide context for the annual report received by LPAO on the financial performance of the University’s collaborative partnerships.

5.2 The purpose of the Faculty Annual Review reports is:

- to assure the University that the annual programme review process has been properly conducted within the Faculty and its partner organisation; and that either it is complete or appropriate action is being taken to ensure that any missing reports are submitted within an appropriate timescale;
- to provide assurance to the University that academic (and professional) standards and quality are being assured and maintained across the full range of the provision for which the Faculty is responsible, including collaborative provision;
- to identify issues that require action at Faculty and University level in order to address any risks to the academic quality and standards of the provision managed by the Faculty;
- to highlight good practice in teaching and learning within the Faculty – in particular where it is making a demonstrable contribution to the delivery of the SESE and other University enhancement initiatives - and propose action for dissemination at institutional level.

5.3 The Faculty Annual Review also provides a useful mechanism for reporting back to Heads of Department/School, Programme Leads, partner organisations, students, and PSRBs on action being taken at Faculty level to address issues identified in programme annual review reports.

5.4 The Faculty Annual Review report should draw on evidence from the programme annual review and external examiners’ reports for all provision, including collaborative arrangements, within the Faculty, and should also be informed by the Associate Dean’s (SE) knowledge of relevant external developments. The report should also refer to the Strategic Plan and relevant measures of success. The reports should identify priorities for action within the Faculty - making recommendations also to the University - based on the environment within which they are operating, to ensure that the provision for which they are responsible continues to meet institutional and, where relevant, external performance indicators.

5.5 The report must provide an analysis - against relevant (internal and external) benchmarks, targets and KPIs - of the quality and standards of the academic provision within the Faculty, and identify any action required to exploit potential opportunities, and minimise risks facing the Departments/Schools within the Faculty from both internal and external factors.

5.6 Quantitative data on a range of institutional performance indicators is made available to report authors via the APTT using the annual review data report, which can be used to view data at programme level (for programme annual review) and also by subject area and by programme type (for faculty-level analysis). Authors should make particular reference to the achievement data for students who fall within the OFFA categories, and for international students.

5.7 The reporting templates ([T3.4a and T3.4b](#)) are available on the [APQQ website](#). As with programme-level annual review reports, the Faculty report should be evidence-based, concise and evaluative. Statistics may be extracted from the APTT annual review data report at a range of levels, and this should be used to inform the Faculty report.

5.8 Associate Deans (Student Experience) are also required to report annually to AESC on the operation of the Academic Guidance Framework within the Faculty. From the 2014-15 reporting cycle, this is incorporated into the Faculty Annual Review report for home provision.
6. **Annual Quality Review**

6.1 The Annual Quality Review is prepared by the Head of APQO each year, to provide AESC with an overview of the outcomes of the University's QA processes, and any themes that have emerged, during the academic year under review (this includes: programme approval and periodic review events, collaborative provision annual programme reviews, external examiners' reports, etc), and to enable AESC to highlight areas for institutional-level action and quality enhancement in the following academic year.
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