Recommendations requiring explicit approval or specific action by SLTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute no.</th>
<th>Subject (in brief)</th>
<th>Approval and/or Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.2 (2)    | **Annual monitoring of taught programmes 2004-05.**  
Summary of key issues for consideration at institutional level highlighted by faculties & schools.  
Appended PAPER G3 | To note the completion of annual monitoring reporting.  
To consider the key issues (Section 1, para 1).  
To note that SAQC has requested an update on actions. |
| 3.         | **Policy development: Programme Review**  
SAQC considered proposals for revised documentation for internal programme reviews, and approved them for piloting.  
Appended PAPER G4 | To confirm approval for piloting, with reporting of outcomes to a future meeting of SAQC.  
To note that guidance resources will be prepared to support use of the new approach. |
| 9. (3)     | **Minor changes to ASQ policies**  
SAQC approved minor changes to the current procedures for programme and module approval  
Appended PAPER G5 | To confirm approval |

Other matters deemed to be of particular significance or of special interest to SLTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute no.</th>
<th>Subject (in brief)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.         | **Thematic topic: Quality Assurance and enhancement in the new academic structure**  
SAQC discussed a range of issues associated with management of, and reporting from QA procedures in the new college-based organisation structure | To note the discussion.  
To note that SAQC has asked the Director of QA to consult the relevant faculty staff on ideas for new structures for quality assurance and enhancement and to report the outcomes to the Vice Principal (Educational Development) for input into the restructuring process. |
| 5.         | **QAA ELIR Follow-up**  
SAQC approved the report to be submitted to QAA in preparation for the Annual Discussion, scheduled for 19 June 2006.  
Appended PAPER G6 | To note the final version of the updating report submitted to QAA. |
| 9. (1)     | **AUT Action: Effect on Student Assessment**  
SAQC discussed student concerns and University guidance to staff and students. | To note that SAQC asked the Convener to consult the Academic Secretary on the drafting of further guidance for Boards of Examiners, for consideration by Senate, at its June meeting. |
| 2.1        | **Update on recent external developments**  
Summary of recent external developments and activities relating to quality assurance and enhancement. | For information Available at: http://www.dundee.ac.uk/quality/info/ext-ov.htm |
A meeting of the Committee was held on Monday 25 April 2006.

Present: Professor J Calderhead (Convener), Ms H O'Connor, Dr A T Davidson, Dr M Ward, Dr A Munns, Dr M Wynne-Davies, Dr L Corden (vice Professor D Rowley), Mr S Dow (vice Ms L A Stevenson), Mr W I Ball, Dr L Walsh, Ms L Bibby

In attendance: Dr E Monaghan

Preliminary Remarks: to welcome Mr S Dow to his first meeting of the Committee.

1. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

1.1 Minute of Previous Meeting

Resolved:

(1) to approve the minutes of the meeting of 27 February 2006 which the Senate had approved without observations; and

(2) to note the report of the Learning and Teaching Committee’s comments on those minutes (its meeting of 13 March 2006 refers).

1.2 Matters Arising from Previous Meetings for Consideration

1.2. ASQ6 Annual Programme Monitoring 2003-04: Overview of Annual Monitoring

(1) Staff/Student Ratios Derived from the University’s HESA Data

The Convener reported that there was an awareness that the University’s current approach to reporting data to HESA lacked appropriate coordination which might be addressed through a new staff appointment with specific responsibility for this task. This new appointment would have obvious benefits for both the generation of accurate internal management information and the submission of the HESA return.

Resolved: to ask the Convener to keep the Committee informed of progress in this area.

(2) Outstanding Reports: Annual Programme Monitoring 2004-05: Overview of Annual Monitoring Exercise
The Committee received the outstanding annual programme monitoring reports for academic session 2004/05 from the Schools of Dentistry and Nursing & Midwifery together with a revised summary paper from Dr A T Davidson reflecting institutional-level issues identified during this exercise.

The major topics reported in the summary paper were perceived deficiencies in centrally managed teaching accommodation and issues related to the Registry and the student management system. With reference to the former issue, it was noted that the recent lecture room usage surveys undertaken by the Room Bookings Service and Estates & Buildings on behalf of the Learning & Teaching Environment Subcommittee, had suggested a significant under utilisation of centrally managed teaching rooms. In discussion, it was noted that this finding might reflect the unsuitability of the teaching rooms for modern teaching practice. The lack of adequate teaching accommodation on the Ninewells campus was also noted.

Resolved:

(1) to ask Dr Davidson to consult Dr R Aboud, Medical School, to obtain the final outstanding programme monitoring report for session 2004/05 on the taught Masters programmes delivered by the Medical School;

(2) following receipt of that outstanding report, to ask Dr Davidson to update his summary paper, as appropriate, for submission to the next meeting of the Learning & Teaching Committee on 15 May 2006 (SLTC 15May06 PAPER G3 refers); and

(3) to ask Dr Davidson to add a table to his summary paper highlighting the actions that had been taken to address the topics identified in the summary of topics section (paragraph 1 of the paper refers), who had responsibility for addressing each topic and any outstanding topics for action, for submission to a future meeting of the Committee.

2. ROUTINE REPORTING FROM FACULTIES, SCHOOLS AND DUSA

The Committee received routine reports on the business of recent meetings of the following Faculty and School Academic Quality Committees: Engineering & Physical Sciences (18 April 2006); Law & Accountancy (30 March 2006); Medical School (UMEC) [including issues arising from the annual programme monitoring of the BMSc programmes for 2004/05] (April 2006); and Nursing & Midwifery (22 March 2006). There were no issues raised for action by the Committee.

Resolved: to note the reports.
3. POLICY DEVELOPMENT: PROGRAMME REVIEW

Following from the Committee’s consideration, at its meeting of 27 February 2006, of Dr Davidson’s proposed amendments to the academic standards procedures for the periodic review of taught programmes, Dr A T Davidson presented a further paper setting out his ideas concerning the documentation for future reviews.

The documentation followed two strands, operational and review documents. Of the three operational documents, it was expected that the Programme Specification would be available, in time, from a centrally held web-based repository of such specifications. The Programme Learning Strategy was a new document, aimed at identifying how the programme team would promote learning and outline expectations of students and their responsibilities as learners on the programme. Of the five review documents, the Student Views report, the Programme Reflection and the Effective Practice Mini-Case studies were new. The Student Views report would enhance student involvement in the review process and DUSA might be expected to have a direct input to the preparation of this document. The new Student Experience Working Group, led by the Convener, was developing routes to enhance the effectiveness of student feedback in a number of areas including programme review and students’ views on the effectiveness of central services. This Group would submit its proposals to a future meeting of the Committee, once they were sufficiently developed. It was expected that, in due course, the majority of the statistical information for the Programme Profile would be provided routinely by the Registry from the Student Management System.

The Programme Reflection document was a replacement for the existing Programme Evaluation Summary document. The overlap between the Programme Learning Strategy and the Programme Reflection was explored in the discussion but it was agreed that each document fulfilled a distinct and specific role in the review process and should not be conflated.

Dr Davidson would draft comprehensive guide notes, for staff and students, on the documentation and provide, where appropriate, the relevant templates, following approval of the outline proposals.

Resolved:

(1) to welcome and approve Dr Davidson’s outline proposals (SLTC 15May06 PAPER G4 refers) for a new documentation structure to enhance the programme review process but to ask him to amend his paper to indicate that the format for the presentation of the documentation should be intranet based; and
to ask Dr Davidson to pilot the use of this new structure during the next academic session and to report the outcome of that pilot to a future meeting of the Committee.

4. THEMATIC TOPIC: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT IN THE NEW ACADEMIC STRUCTURE

The Committee received a discussion paper from Dr A T Davidson highlighting issues and questions regarding the future management of quality assurance and enhancement in the new University structure based on four Colleges and a total of fifteen Schools (http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/academic/restructuring.pdf refers). Members were asked to consult within their Faculty on this paper and be prepared to provide the Committee with a view on the issues identified in the discussion paper.

Key issues to be addressed were the articulation of the new Academic Quality Committee structure and related responsibilities at the institutional, College and School levels, and the transition arrangements involving mapping these responsibilities and structure from the present situation to the future.

Opening the discussion, it was noted that the Academic Quality Committee of the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, at its meeting of 31 March 2006 had decided the following on the issue of restructuring, as reported in the following extract from the minutes of that meeting:

“Item 13.1 Restructuring

The members recognise that restructuring will have an effect on the management of academic quality.

Resolved: To request that the University Academic Quality Committee consider the following points for implementation within the new University structure:

- The importance of providing guidance and training on academic quality to key members of staff.

- To manage modules at School level (approval, changes, termination, etc.).

- To manage programmes at College level (approval, changes, termination, review, annual monitoring, etc.).

- To appoint an Academic Quality Officer within each School to monitor the management of modules and report to the College Academic Quality Committee.

- To split School and College Academic Quality Committee meetings as follows:
Other points raised in discussion were:

- the significant variation in the size of the four Colleges, in terms of the number of Schools involved, and the need to consider whether different Committee structures were required in different Colleges to reflect College size

- that the Colleges of Life Sciences and Medicine, Nursing & Dentistry might retain their existing quality management and enhancement structures

- the level of business that Committees concerned with quality assurance and enhancement could expect to be able to deal with effectively, again reflecting the size of their constituency

- whether the business of Academic Quality Committees, at the institutional and College levels, could be integrated effectively into a Learning & Teaching Committee structure at either level and for each College given the variation in College sizes

- the management of quality assurance and enhancement at the institutional, College and School levels and the link between resource allocation and quality assurance and enhancement as resource allocation may occur predominantly at the School level

- the allocation of responsibility by the new College Vice Principals for quality assurance and enhancement perhaps, at the operational level, through delegation to the new College Heads of Learning & Teaching

It was agreed that whatever structure was chosen for the management of quality assurance and enhancement, it must be reviewed after the first year of operation to determine whether it was operating effectively.

**Resolved:**

1. to ask the Learning & Teaching Committee to note the above observations; and

2. to ask Dr Davidson to consult the relevant Faculty staff on ideas for the new structures for quality assurance and enhancement and to ask him to report the outcomes to the Convener for input into the restructuring process.
5. **QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY (QAA): ELIR FOLLOW-UP**

The Committee received a paper from Dr A T Davidson on the University’s submission to the QAA to support the Annual Discussion between the Agency and senior representatives from the University and DUSA. That meeting had been arranged for 19 June 2006 and the joint University/DUSA team would comprise the Convener, Dr Davidson, Dr I K Francis, and either Ms Bibby or Ms J Koprowska.

Ms Bibby suggested that a reference be added to the section on “Partnership working between staff, in academic and support units, and DUSA”, to the recent student survey of student welfare services coordinated by the Student Welfare Services Working Group comprising DUSA and Student Services. Dr Davidson was asked to consult Ms Bibby on the drafting of that reference.

**Resolved:** to approve the draft (SLTC 15May06 PAPER G6 refers) subject to the above amendments.

9 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

(1) **AUT Action: Effect on Student Assessment**

Ms Bibby highlighted students’ extreme concerns relating to the effect of the current AUT action on the conduct of their assessment. The University had already issued the following guidance to staff and students on its response to the AUT action:

http://www.dundee.ac.uk/pressreleases/prapril06/exams.html

http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/registry/exams/2006/AUTASOS.htm

http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/registry/exams/2006/AUTASOSHoD.htm

**Resolved:** to ask the Convener to consult the Academic Secretary, Dr I K Francis, on the drafting of further guidance for Boards of Examiners, for consideration by Senate, at its June meeting, on the implications of the AUT action for student assessment to complement the guidance already provided above.

(2) **Staff E-Learning Survey: Final report**

The Committee received the final report of the staff e-learning survey conducted by the Learning Enhancement Unit.

**Resolved:** to note the final report which would be considered by the Sub-Committee on the Flexible Delivery of Learning, at its meeting of 3 May 2006.

(3) **Minor Changes to Academic Standards Quality Policies**
The Committee received a paper from Dr A Davidson concerning minor changes to the current academic standards procedures for Programme and Module Approval and Students’ Placement Policy. On the latter, concern was expressed over the wording of the paragraph on the appropriateness of the placement setting, in the context of the conduct of risk assessments for student placements.

Resolved: to approve the changes to Programme and Module Approval policy but to reject the proposal concerning Students’ Placement policy (SLTC 15May06 PAPER G5 refers).

SECTION 2

1. EXTERNAL QUALITY NEWS UPDATE

The Committee received a paper from Dr A T Davidson identifying recent developments in external quality assurance.

Resolved: to note that the paper would be made available on the University’s quality assurance website (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/quality/ refers).

2. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved: to note that the dates of the Committee's future meetings would be circulated once the full implications of the University restructuring for the Committee were available

Professor J Calderhead
Convener
8 May 2006
Purpose

1. This paper is an updated version of the annual report to SAQC on outcomes from annual monitoring (ASQ6) of taught provision for session 2004-05. It is set out under the following headings:
   - Section 1: Summary of issues identified by faculties for consideration or action at institutional level, or by support services
   - Section 2: Summary of effective practice identified by faculties

2. Appendices including the ASQ6.3 reports (in full) from the following faculties were considered by SAQC on 27 Feb 06:
   - Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (AS)
   - Faculty of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design (DoJ)
   - Faculty of Education and Social Work (ESW)
   - Faculty of Engineering & Physical Sciences (EPS)
   - Faculty of Law and Accountancy (LA)
   - Faculty of Life Sciences (LS)
   - School of Medicine (MD)

3. This updated overview provides a summary of issues highlighted by all of the faculties/schools listed above under the following headings:
   - Section 1: Issues identified by faculties for consideration or action at institutional level
   - Section 2: Effective practice identified by faculties, which could have wider relevance

Questions and further information

Contact Alan Davidson, Director of QA
SECTION 1:
Issues identified by faculties for consideration or action at institutional level

Summary of topics

1. Faculties and schools have highlighted a number of issues for consideration at institutional level, under the following broad headings:
   - operational issues relating to joint programmes (para 2)
   - student feedback, using on-line questionnaires (para 3)
   - external examining (paras 4-5, also noted as a School issue by Nursing & Midwifery)
   - Registry and student management system (paras 6, 11, 15, 16) -reported by 3 faculties/schools
   - assessment policy (paras 7-8, ifand in and infant in in the infant and and28)
   - modularisation and semesterisation (paras 9-10)
   - teaching accommodation (paras 12-14, 0, 20, 24, 26) -reported by 5 faculties/schools
   - specific situation and needs of postgraduate programmes and students (paras 12, 15, 21)
   - IT resources (para 17)
   - plagiarism detection (para 19)
   - levels of SFC funding resource for clinical dental teaching (para 22)
   - staffing levels with respect to student intake (para 23, 25)
   - reduced or limited access by students studying at remote sites to University Support Services (para 27)

Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (AS)

2. ELIR was seen as a positive experience. Faculty recommends that Joint Exam Boards should take more detailed minutes with regard to operational issues and that Programme Reviews should take more account of Joint provision.

Faculty of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design (DoJ)

3. Poor response to on-line questionnaires. Discussion at ASQ committee required.

Faculty of Education and Social Work (ESW)

4. Enhanced mechanism for receipt of External Examiner reports.
   - Unfortunately, some External Examiner reports were not received within the deadline for receipt. This inhibits the ability to provide formal feedback within the programme monitoring reports. The University is asked to review the timescales for reminding Examiners of the timeframe within which they need to submit reports

5. Guidance on the preferred reporting structure and format for receiving the Faculty’s response to External Examiner comments.
   - In responding to reports from External Examiners, there remains some concern about the mechanism for responding. It is good practice and a Faculty requirement for Programme Leaders to respond to External Examiners comments, both personally and in the annual monitoring reports. However, the Academic Secretary also makes a requirement for Programme Leaders to respond to identified aspects of the External Examiners reports. These particular issues, identified by the Academic Secretary are then recorded in the Faculty annual monitoring report. It would be helpful to the Faculty for the Academic Standards Committee to give guidance on its expectations of faculties when responding to External Examiner comments.
6. Transfer of CPD student information into the student management system (SMS); this data has been awaiting migration since merger.

Faculty of Engineering & Physical Sciences (EPS)

7. Concern has been expressed by one external examiner at the rigid nature of the degree thresholds which determine the class of degree awarded. These were seen to be restricting the ability of the examination committee, and potentially preventing students achieving higher awards.
   - Action: It is requested that the new assessment policy consider the rigidity of these thresholds.

8. External examiners expressed considerable concerns about the new reporting scale. One in particular commented, “This was tried as Sheffield in the 1990s and eventually abandoned after adverse comments from external examiners and employers”.
   - Action: It is requested that the new assessment policy consider these comments.

9. Revision time at the end of Semester 1 prior to the start of examinations is restricted compared to Semester 2. It is of concern that one Division has felt it necessary to move two modules from Semester 1 to Semester 2 apparently solely because the structure of Semester 1 allows insufficient revision time before the December exams.
   - Action: The University is asked to consider if the structure of Semester 1 is having a detrimental effect on student learning and progression.

10. Lack of examinations at end of first semester in first year restricts the assessment opportunities, and as a result some students are not well prepared for examinations at the end of the second semester.
    - Action: It is requested that Faculties are allowed greater flexibility in deciding on the most appropriate assessment methods for their programmes.

11. Lack of central co-ordination of modules, charging and availability makes it difficult to guarantee that modules will be available to students from one year to the next.
    - Action: It is requested that the University considers the development of a central system to guarantee the availability and cost of modules.

Faculty of Law and Accountancy (LA)

12. Request for Faculty Postgraduate Facilities for the growing number of taught and research postgraduate students – building has been identified for refurbishment on a temporary basis - Dean pursuing with University Secretary and Director of Campus Services.

13. Need for sufficient well-equipped central teaching space - issue raised with University Secretary, Director of Campus Services and Learning and Teaching Committee.

14. Departments within the Faculty are unable to increase their teaching activities, staff, and student numbers due to accommodation constraints. Plans are underway to relocate the Centre for Energy, Petroleum and Mineral Law and Policy and the International Water Law Research Institute, but both the Departments of Law and Accountancy and Business Finance require additional accommodation - space audits are planned/being undertaken for the Departments of Law and Accountancy and Business Finance.

15. There is a need to improve the University administration and infrastructure for postgraduate students which is currently geared towards undergraduate students - issue raised with the Deputy Director of Registry and the Postgraduate School Board of Studies.

16. Request for COGNOS reports on the analysis of module and programme results for taught undergraduate programmes – request made to ICS Strategic Management Information.
Faculty of Life Sciences (LS)

17. A major area of concern is the apparent lack of communication between ICS and the LEU when there are changes to desktops and operating systems. There have been instances when the implementation of new software has led to knock-on disruption to learning & teaching. The most recent example (not 2004/05, but a perfect illustration) is that the change of operating systems resulted in the inability of staff to run the QMP software, on which we are heavily dependent. As this AS6.3 report is being written, installation of updated software has corrupted the passwords of LS students and LSTU staff, creating mayhem, anger and frustration. Better forward communication, planning and thorough test-drives on dummy LS accounts before general release would seem to be essential if we are to minimize such events and the ensuing need for fire-fighting.

School of Medicine (MD)

Undergraduate programmes
18. Accommodation in and out of Dundee (necessity of resource, Academic Quality Committee)
19. Plagiarism software (being developed with Information and Communication Services)
20. Small Group teaching space (Learning Environment Committee)

Taught Masters programmes
21. Lack of proper infrastructure to sustain and support current programmes and a platform to develop new programmes or expand the intake on current ones, e.g. teaching accommodation and adequate financial return to courses.

School of Dentistry (DN)

22. Unresolved issues with SFC regarding level of funding for clinical parts of programme.
23. Need to respond to GDC concerns about staffing levels
24. Need for urgent refurbishment of outdated teaching facilities as current accommodation was deemed unsatisfactory by the GDC.
25. Increased student intake is placing increasing strain on already stretched staffing levels.

School of Nursing and Midwifery (NM)

26. Continuing pressures on Estate and consequent impact on student experience and staff resource which has lead to the need for duplicate teaching across sites.
27. Quality of the students educational experience and reduced or limited access to University Support Services for students studying at remote sites.
28. External Examiners consistently and continually refer to the need for students to receive written feedback regarding examination.
SECTION 2: Effective practice identified by faculties, which could have wider relevance

Faculty of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design (DoJ)

1. The School of Design had run an interdisciplinary project linked to the study visit to New York. This was very successful and was a good way of encouraging interaction between staff on different programmes.
2. It had been identified that students who withdraw from a programme intending to return at a later date benefit from a period of continuity of communication to support their return.

Faculty of Engineering & Physical Sciences (EPS)

3. Economics: the Division has carried out a successful trial of the new plagiarism detection system on Blackboard, and intends it to be used across the programme in 2005/6.
4. Applied Computing: new module “Argumentation for Computing” assists students with logical thinking and constructing arguments (good attributes for final year projects.)
6. MSc in Display Technology, Systems and Applications: provision of a highly multi-disciplinary programme in a fast moving, high technology field, taught to the highest standards with state-of-the-art demonstrations given by world experts

Faculty of Law and Accountancy (LA)

7. Development of induction arrangements specifically for the needs of international and direct entrant students.
8. Identification of language needs of international students and arrangement of effective provision to meet these (MAcc).
9. Posting evaluations of student questionnaires on Blackboard.
10. Increasing requirement for student work to be submitted electronically in order to take advantage of the University software for detecting plagiarism.
11. Continuing development of Blackboard for all modules across the Faculty e.g. the way in which the Department of Law has embedded Blackboard in all of its modules was cited in the ELIR report.

Faculty of Life Sciences (LS)

12. Worthy of special mention is the commitment and support we have received from Ruth O’Riordan in Careers Service. Ruth has helped accomplish a complete transformation in the levels of interactions between LS students & staff with the Careers Service. She has been instrumental in the planning and extremely successful introduction of PDPs to our Level 1 students. This is an excellent illustration of the enhanced effectiveness that is created between faculties and support services when each has a nominated specialist link person.
13. We have also enjoyed good support from the LEU.

School of Nursing & Midwifery (NM)

14. Both the Nursing and Midwifery Professional Officers commended the School on the use of current best practice - ‘My Dundee’ as a support for learning tool. The genuine
partnership working between the School and the NHS in the review, development and approval of the new pre registration programmes was cited as exemplary practice.
SENATE ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE
Programme Review process: Ideas for discussion concerning documents

Version: 8 May 2006, approved by SAQC, for consideration by SLTC

Background

1. At its meeting on 27 Feb 2006, SAQC welcomed outlined proposals for revision to the periodic programme procedure. The main objectives of this policy review are to:
   • make the process more enhancement-oriented
   • make the process more efficient, in particular by trying to reduce volume of documentation
   • make the process more forward-looking, with better linkages to strategy and planning
   • align the process with the new college & school academic organisation structure
   • encourage effective student engagement

2. Ideas for discussion about the process and documentation are summarised in Fig 1, appended, and the proposed forms of document are described below.

3. At its meeting on 25 Apr 2006, SAQC:
   • welcomed these proposals, with the addition of the requirement that the University intranet should be used to manage and communicate all programme review documentation (added to this version as para 23)
   • approved the proposals for piloting, with outcomes to be reported to a future meeting of SAQC

Documents and uses

4. The following documents should be considered as operational documents, useful in the day-to-day operation of programme:
   • Programme Specification
   • Programme Learning Strategy
   • Programme Enhancement Action Plan

5. They should be updated routinely, including as part of Annual Programme Review (monitoring). Periodic Programme Review would be an opportunity to review and revise these documents, and to develop proposed revisions or replacements. The review report and subsequent faculty (school / college) board would confirm approval of these for the future, including any conditions specified by the review board.

6. In addition, the following review documents would be used by the programme team, to guide evaluation and reflection; and by the review board, to engage in dialogue with the programme team:
   • Programme Reflection
   • Effective Practice mini case studies

7. The following documents would be prepared and be available as background references:
   • Programme Profile
   • Student Views report

8. The review board would prepare the Periodic Programme Review Report, and would agree the portfolio of Effective Practice mini case studies to be appended to the report.
Notes on specific documents

Programme Specification
9. This defines and describes the programme in a concise, standard format.

Programme Learning Strategy
10. Statement of the programme team’s approach to promoting student learning on the programme. It should highlight specific features, elements of approach, and opportunities e.g. underpinning concepts, philosophies or ideas; vision of a graduate; use of technology; professional dimensions etc.
11. It should also outline expectations of students and their responsibilities as learners on the programme.
12. This could be written as, and termed a School Learning Strategy if appropriate. It could be written for students, and could form part of a student handbook or similar

Programme Enhancement Action Plan
13. Statement of what the programme team is going to do in the future to enhance any aspect of the programme. The nature of action points, and level of detail may be flexible, reflecting outcomes, perhaps provisional or interim, from the evaluation and reflection within the review process. Action points may include further or continuing evaluation.
14. The Action Plan should be updated routinely, and specifically as part of Annual Programme Review

Programme Reflection
15. What students are expected to learn: reflection on the value of the programme in terms of standards and relevance of aims and intended learning outcomes. This should include consideration of:
   - standards of the programme with reference to University expectations of graduates (ref L&T Strategy), SCQF, QAA Subject Benchmark (where relevant), PSB criteria and guidelines (where relevant), employability, and external examiners’ comments
   - currency –is the curriculum up-to-date and relevant to the needs of graduates of the future?
   - volume of content and student workload. Has the programme gained ‘fat’ over time, what scope is there for cutting out content that is no longer relevant or essential?
16. How students learn: reflection on the effectiveness of student learning and the student experience. This should include consideration of the effectiveness of:
   - learning and achievement by students on the programme
   - teaching, planned student activities, use of technology, assessment, academic guidance and support, learning environment and resources.

Programme Profile
17. This is a factual document primarily for reference. The headings should include information that is used and is useful at faculty, (school & college) and programme levels for planning and operational management.
18. Data should be provided for the past three years unless noted otherwise, and should include the following headings:
   - Student applications and admissions
   - Student numbers and progression, three years data for programme level, data for the most recent single year at module level. This information should be supplied routinely, in a standard report form, via SITS/Cognos
   - Graduate destinations
   - Staff: current complement, names and appointments, including part-time, postgraduate assistants/tutors etc
• Specialist resources or features e.g. equipment, accommodation, technology, use of placements etc
• External Examiners comments: digest of keypoints from reports, correspondence and minutes of exam boards
• External review reports (where relevant e.g. related to professional accreditation): digest of keypoints

**Student Views Report / Periodic Review Student Questionnaire**

19. A standard questionnaire, would be issued and analysed centrally, generating a report in a standard format. The report would be issued to the programme team and the students who completed the questionnaire survey. It is expected that follow-up discussions with students (e.g. focus groups) would be used to explore issues identified and discuss possible enhancement actions.

**Effective Practice mini case studies**

20. A standard template for staff to outline cases of effective practice, in a concise format (e.g. 1 side A4 max). The portfolio of these would be submitted to the review board. Subject to any comments by the review board, the mini case studies would be made available on the University intranet for reference by staff and students within the University.

21. An indicative draft template is noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is working well for us</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyword(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key points of approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting information (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Periodic Programme Review Report**

22. Template of headings to be developed

**Communication of documentation**

23. The University intranet should be used to communicate all documentation relating to programme reviews.

**Questions and further information**

Contact Alan Davidson, Director of QA

**Appendices**

Fig 1: Summary chart
New Periodic Programme Review process: Ideas for discussion

Ideas for possible revision of ASQ5 Programme
Review process, prepared by Alan Davidson
Version: 17April06
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SENATE ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE
Minor changes to ASQ policies

Purpose and recommendations

SAQC is requested to approve changes to three policy statements to take account of comments received from academic units.

Programme Approval Policy

14. Following initial scrutiny, the relevant faculty secretary should post the approval documents on a secure area of the University intranet. The posting process would include notification to key executives in student and academic support services, other faculties, and DUSA.
15. The approval documents should be available for consultation for a minimum period of four weeks (not counting University vacations) two weeks. Any member of staff or DUSA may:
   • discuss any issues with departmental staff who are leading the proposal
   • submit comments on the proposal to the faculty secretary.

Module Approval Policy

14. Following initial scrutiny, the relevant faculty secretary should post the approval documents on a secure area of the University intranet. Key executives in student and academic support services, other faculties, and DUSA should be notified of posting.
15. The approval documents should be available for consultation for a minimum period of four weeks (not counting University vacations) two weeks. Any member of staff or DUSA may:
   • discuss any issues with departmental staff who are leading the proposal
   • submit comments on the proposal to the faculty secretary.

Questions and further information

Contact Alan Davidson, Director of QA
University of Dundee: QAA Follow-up to the ELIR Report

Executive summary
1. This paper refers to:
   - the QAA ELIR report for the University of Dundee, Nov 2004
   - QAA Notes of Guidance for Institutions on Follow-up to the ELIR Report
2. The paper includes the following sections:
   - How consideration of the ELIR report and subsequent action has been taken forward
   - The University's view of the outcomes of the ELIR report
   - Actions taken in response
   - Other developments, in particular the reorganisation of the academic structure of the University.
3. It is acknowledged that this report is primarily a summary of development actions and plans, and that it does not include evaluation and reflection on the impacts and effectiveness. This is attributable to the timescale, the extent and nature of developments, in particular the reorganisation of the academic structure of University, and their demands on staff resources. The importance of evidence-based reflection is recognised and this will be a mid-term priority as implementation of actions progresses.

How consideration of the ELIR report and subsequent action has been taken forward
4. The ELIR report was made available to all staff and students within the University via the intranet. It was formally considered at institutional level by Senate Academic Quality Committee (SAQC); Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC); Senate and Court.
5. The Director of QA prepared an Action Summary which was approved by SAQC and SLTC; this is informing ongoing actions.

The University's view of the outcomes of the ELIR report
6. The University accepts and welcomes the view expressed in the ELIR report and commentaries. The ELIR report recognises and engages with the University's self-evaluation, the plans set-out in the RA, and discussion during the ELIR visit. The ELIR process and report have been very useful contributions to the ongoing development of the University's strategies and processes for quality management.

Actions taken in response
Reflection on the University's engagement with the ELIR process
7. An early action by the Director of QA was to prepare a short report reflecting on the University's engagement with the ELIR process in general. This was based on the following inputs: personal observation and reflection; de-briefing staff following meetings with the ELIR team; and the key findings letter. The objectives were to capture perceptions at that stage, and to consider what the University could learn from its engagement with the process. Following from this, to identify broad messages for consideration and possible action at institutional level.

ELIR Action Summary
8. Following receipt of the report, an ELIR Action Summary was prepared. This summarised action points contained within both the RA prepared by the University and the ELIR Report. It collected topics under a set of 10 broad headings, and also identified four over-arching themes that appeared significant in the ELIR Report:
   - the need for a University strategy for learning and teaching, incorporating quality enhancement
   - identification and dissemination of good practice across the University
   - partnership working, between staff, in academic and support units, and DUSA
   - the importance of effective informal communications, in addition to formal systems.
9. The ELIR Action summary was discussed and approved by SAQC. Following this, lead responsibilities for follow-up were allocated, and the final ELIR Action Summary was discussed and approved by SLTC. The ELIR Action Summary is being used as an ongoing guide and reference to shape a range of strategic and policy developments, in particular a new University-level Learning and Teaching Strategy (LTS) that includes Quality Enhancement strategic actions. The ELIR Action Summary highlighted **four over-arching areas**, and these are used as headings in this report for discussion of progress.

### A new University-level Learning and Teaching Strategy

10. Early development discussion concerning the new LTS took place in parallel with preparation of the ELIR RA, and there was a useful synergy between the two processes, in particular regarding institutional context. The ELIR Report and ELIR Action summary have in turn informed recent, more detailed development of the LTS. This is now being discussed by faculties, to inform a proposed final version to be approved in the near future. This will then become the primary strategic reference policy for learning and teaching and quality enhancement of taught provision across the University. Significantly, the LTS seeks to embed an enhancement led approach to quality in the new academic organisation structure (see below)

### Identification and dissemination of good practice

11. The new LTS recognises the significance of identifying, disseminating and rewarding good practice, and it identifies a number of objectives and action points that are being taken forward in via quality assurance procedures and academic professional development.

12. Revisions to quality assurance and enhancement procedures for internal periodic subject review emphasise and embed identification of good practice, requiring submission of mini-case studies 'What is working well for us'. Planned developments in student evaluation surveys will seek to identify students' views on good practice, which can then be followed-up and disseminated.

13. Academic Professional Development activities include the introduction of an annual conference, with external keynote speakers highlighting effective practice.

14. The University’s annual ‘Discovery Days’ event has now added ‘Celebrating Excellence in Teaching’ to the established presentations highlighting developments in research.

### Partnership working, between staff, in academic and support units, and DUSA

15. The foundations of effective partnership working were established during engagement with the ELIR process and development is progressing in a number of ways.

16. A new University / DUSA Liaison Group has been established.

17. A new Student Services Working Group has been established, with an early task to conduct a student welfare survey.

18. To emphasise the importance of DUSA’s lead role in promoting effective student representation, the Principal invited the DUSA President to give a presentation to Senate on DUSA developments and partnership working.

19. A joint University / DUSA Student Representation Working Group (SRWG) has been formed, convened by the DUSA President. This group is currently working on two broad priorities:
   - designing student representation in the new academic organisation structure
   - considering incentives to encourage effective student engagement in representation and other co-curricular activities.

20. An additional DUSA full-time sabbatical post has been created, the Vice President Representation, recognising the needs identified in both the RA and report. The VP(R) has been very active, and is taking a lead role in helping shape student representation in the new academic structure (see below). This individual has since been elected as incoming President of DUSA, which will be helpful in maintaining drive and continuity in these actions.
21. Student reviewers are now full members of all internal subject review panels. The DUSA VP (Education and Careers) has taken a lead role in this. All experiences to date have been very positive. Further development, including enhanced guidance on the role of student reviewers is planned.

The importance of effective informal communications, in addition to formal systems

22. By definition, reflection on this aspect is difficult. The Faculty-Quality-Network has continued to be effective in facilitating informal communications in addition to formal. As an example, it has recently been helpful in establishing a network of practitioner contacts for the new Quality Enhancement Theme, *The First Year Experience*.

23. Semi-formal working groups have been established to undertake specific policy development tasks including: Learning and Teaching Strategy; Assessment Policy; Student Representation; and the Student Experience. Whilst formally established, these short-life groups tend to have an inclusive membership and encourage open discussion.

24. In addition to the formal structures and groups discussed above, there is effective, routine informal communication between senior officers of the University and of DUSA.

25. Encouragement of informal communications will be an important consideration in development of, and support for the new academic organisation structure

Other developments
Reorganisation of the academic structure of the University

26. A major development, and the current focus of attention, is the reorganisation of the academic structure of the University. This is scheduled to be operational from 1 August 2006, and will have very significant implications for management of quality across the University.

27. The current faculty-based structure is being replaced by a structure of 17 schools that are essentially subject based, located within four colleges. Each college will be led by a newly-appointed Vice Principal, supported by a college head of learning and teaching, who will have a key role in quality management. SAQC is promoting discussion about effective operation arrangements within the new structure.

28. The faculty-level reflections, in particular the 'enhancement agendas' included as Appendix B of the RA are being updated and will be important components of the handover to the new colleges.

Academic policies

29. A new Assessment policy has been approved, and a new policy on Admissions is being developed.

Staff development

30. A new strategy for personal professional development has been developed and approved, including explicit focus on academic professional development.

31. The University has been awarded an HE Academy *Change Academy* project titled 'Enhancing the student experience as a research-led university re-structures'.

Campus re-development

32. The planned relocation to the Dundee City campus of all activities from the Gardyne Road campus, and many of the activities from the Kirkcaldy campus, will address many of the concerns about aspects of the student experience and satellite campuses.

Conclusion

33. In conclusion, engagement with the ELIR method and review process has been a significant influence, in particular in shaping the new LTS. The past year or so has been focussed primarily on planning and development, of the LTS, on improving effectiveness of student representation, and the reorganisation. The next year or so will be focussed on implementation, and will see extensive action on a range of fronts. As implementation actions progress, there will be an increased effort on evaluation, with reflection on impacts and effectiveness.
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