LTC16D032

Title:	***Faculty Reports (QAR3) on Undergraduate Annual Course Monitoring 2015/16***
Author:	Michele Pavey
Circulation:	LTC – 24 November 2016
Agenda:	LTC16A002
Version:	Final
Status:	Open

Issue

University wide issues identified by Schools during the 2015/16 undergraduate annual course monitoring process.

In 2015/16 it was agreed that LTC would consider University wide issues raised by Schools in the Annual Course Monitoring: School Summaries (QAR3) and ensure that Schools received a response to these matters.

Recommendation

Recipients are invited:

To consider the issues raised by Schools and determine, where practicable, either resolutions or the most appropriate forum for their consideration.

Resource Implications

Variable, depending on the issues raised.

Risk Implications

N/A

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

The Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching)- Professor N. Selby (HUM), Ms R. Chakraborty (SSF), Mrs E. Sutton (FMH), Professor D. Stevens (SCI).

2015/16 Undergraduate Annual Module and Course Review: Issues for University Wide Consideration raised in QAR3 forms

HUM

School	Issue	LTC Response	Action
Interdisciplinary Institute for the Humanities	Response rates for **student module evaluations** are consistently low, and any reports based on them are limited by the number of students whose feedback is included. This is presumably a university-wide issue		
LDC	the steady **removal of optionality** on our Literature and Literature-related degrees. Q300 in particular is at risk of losing a crucial USP, which is worrying given the decline in admissions figures. The availability of choice on Literature degrees is what sets UEA apart from its competitors – *every* Literature degree above us in the League tables offers optionality, and makes that optionality prominent in their promotional literature. Optionality is also vital in retaining our students and ensuring that they report a positive student experience at the end of their degree. It's particularly telling that the removal of some modules on some Course Profiles has led to a rise in 'Variation to Course Profile' requests. The **Module enrolment process** is extremely important for student satisfaction and student retention, but it's administratively burdensome, and the timing of processes is ill suited to a School that needs its students to prepare and read over the summer. • Students select their modules in March, but are not informed of the outcome until mid-August. This is too late in the year for staff to inform them of the reading they need to do to prepare. • The TD's administrative work in this area has been vastly reduced thanks to the work of LTS colleagues. LTS have managed to identify problems early, and have streamlined the ways in which I receive information. Decisions have		

	been considerably easier to make in 2015-16. • There have also been considerable improvements in the line of communication between Study Abroad and LTS. We'd like to thank them both for their enormous efforts in this area. • Would the University consider an automatic enrolment process, to bring us into the 21st century? Lots of other Universities use an online system. Problems with the **LTS policy** of **holding onto *all* student work on a large module** if one or more seminar batches are delayed. This was the case in 11 out of 39 cases, and has had a noticeably negative impact on NSS figures regarding the promptness of coursework return in LDC; Problems with the **LTS policy** of academics holding onto **uncollected student work**. Shifting an administrative role to academics does not solve the problem, although we imagine that electronic marking – where it is adopted – will. Problems with the **Extension policy,** most notably the **self-certification** policy, which has meant that academics hardly ever receive a full batch of work on time. It also creates confused expectations about coursework return amongst the student body; **Administrative procedures** – such as updating the Catalogue, updating Programme Specifications and updating Course Profiles,completing the Peer Observation Report, and indeed completing this Annual Course Review, are hindered by the very inefficiency of their design. Many of these procedures involve a to and fro of – or repetition of – information between administrators and academics to no useful end; many of them have been		

	repeatedly tweaked to the point where it no longer remains clear who is to do what, or where the value of the procedure lies. This seems especially evident in the centralisation of the Module Evaluation process: where we had very high submission rates for Module Convenor's reports when the process was managed in-school, our submission rates have now plummeted. The catalogue update, programme specification updates and Course Profile updates are essential. Annual Course Reviews are essential *and* valuable. How can the University make this – and other administrative processes – less burdensome, less complicated, and more efficient?		
PPL	**Response rates for student module evaluations** are consistently low, and any reports based on them are limited by the number of students whose feedback is included. This is presumably a university-wide issue. Part of PPL (philosophy) are returning to module evaluation via hard-copy, with evaluation forms completed in class, rather than allowing students to evaluate modules via evision in the coming year as a pilot. It is hoped that this might improve response rates.		

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	IIH	Year:	2015/16
Courses monitored and updated:	All Humanities Foundation Year Courses		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	The QAR1 forms which have so far been completed indicate that the modules reviewed in 2015-16 were very favourably received by students, and highly praised by the external examiner for quality, rigour, and fairness of feedback in the Institute; the quality of module design within IIH; and IIH's broad range of, and the exceptionally innovative assessment methods for both formative and summative assessment. A further element of good practice is the evident willingness of module organisers to reflect constructively on student evaluations, and to use students' suggestions for improvements as a basis for updating their modules before they are next offered. It is clear that module organisers have also used this process as a way of thinking about their modules more generally, and how they can be further improved. A final notable feature of the QAR1 forms is that none of them comment on students being unhappy with the timescales for return of assessed work. IIH achieved 100% compliance with the 20-working-day policy in 2015-16, and has an action plan in place to maintain this level of compliance.		
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of	The QAR1 forms don't reveal any specific, substantive issues which would need to be addressed, or any problems which would suggest the need for recommendations and changes. Suggestions for improvement are minor and are confined to the module level, and are		

Moderation and Assessment	already being borne in mind and acted on by the module organisers concerned.
Any University wide issues identified:	None evident, although it is noticeable that response rates for student module evaluations are consistently low, and any reports based on them are limited by the number of students whose feedback is included. This is presumably a university-wide issue.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	Please see the list of modules submitted to LTS.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None. There are no modules which include placements.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	The review of modules suggests that all module organisers reflect on student feedback. Reflection on student learning and feedback is an ongoing process, but the department wide module and course review meetings will be an opportunity for the Institute to come together and reflect on issues arising across modules and courses.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Prof Nick Selby
	Date: 18/xi/16
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	-- See above: especially good use of student feedback and peer-to-peer evaluation and innovative forms of assessment
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	Via LTQC and will be fed into current Assessment and Feedback project

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	HIS	Year:	2015/16
Courses monitored and updated:	VISITING STUDIES IN HISTORY (UNDERGRADUATE) HISTORY HISTORY (PART TIME) MODERN HISTORY HISTORY AND POLITICS LANDSCAPE HISTORY GRADUATE DIPLOMA		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	- Strengths remain in terms of diversity of modules offered and careful assessment and feedback on written work. This was also demonstrated by the excellent results of HIS in the NSS. HIS frequently performed significantly above the UEA average across the NSS themes – overall satisfaction was 100% - Excellent progress was made in improving return of coursework within 20 days in 2015-6. HIS was one of the best performing schools in HUM, with a majority of work being returned within 15 days. We have updated the HIS plan of action to further improve its performance regarding 'Assessment and Feedback' and will closely monitor its implementation - In 2016-17 we will see the incremental introduction of e-marking in HIS - We have seen a further Increase use of peer assessment, including technology Enhanced Feedback, to help develop student skills in 2015-16 - We thoroughly reviewed the curriculum and made amendments and addition to reflect students' interests, research trends, staff changes for 2017-18, and the university's programme to increase the employability of UEA students.		

Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	- Continue to monitor closely the implementation of the HIS plan of action to further improve its performance regarding 'Assessment and Feedback' - ensure module organisers co-ordinate the setting of submission deadlines, particularly at level 4 - We have adopted a mark sheet in HIS, to be used for all undergraduate summative coursework, to make the marking descriptors clearer and address student concerns as well as the concerns expressed by some of our external examiners. - Increase use of peer assessment, including technology Enhanced Feedback, to help develop student skills - Monitor the implementation of e-marking
Any University wide issues identified:	
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	LTS has a full list
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	- continuation of staff seminar series 'What we do" - share good practice and discuss new approaches to learning and teaching at School meetings - encourage participation in CSED modules

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Prof Nick Selby
	Date: 17/xi/16
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	See above – continual reflection on pedagogical practice seems well embedded Excellent progress with turnaround times and developing thinking around useful assessment practices
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale.	Via LTQC and will be fed into current Assessment and Feedback project

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	LDC	Year:	2015/16
Courses monitored and updated:	Q300: English Literature Q3W8: English Literature With Creative Writing QT37: English And American Literature QV31: Literature And History W400: Drama (no QAR2 available) WQ43: English Literature And Drama (no QAR2 available) WW84: Scriptwriting And Performance (no QAR2 available)		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	External examiners consistently and repeatedly praise **the quality, rigour, and fairness of feedback** in the School; the quality of **module design** within LDC; and LDC's **broad range of, and the exceptionally innovative assessment methods** for both formative and summative assessment. **Continuous, ongoing, and carefully planned course development**, including: - Option range B at Level 5 in Literature courses, specifically designed to develop students' identity as writers; - Modules designed specifically for Joint Degree students (Literature and History); - HoS and Teaching Committee steering regarding new LDC module proposals; - Extensive consultation regarding the new compulsory First Year module (to run Autumn 2017). **Standardisation of a single summative coursework piece across all Level 4 and 5 Literature modules** (implemented 2014-15 for 2015-16 delivery) This has necessitated a concomitant alignment of student expectations and student engagement across modules. Methods of alignment include: - Seminar preparation as standard – guidance, questions and		

tasks laid out in lectures, and posted up on Blackboard subsequently;
- Formative assessments for seminar discussion;
- Peer Assessment;
- Self-assessment tutorials, which encourage students to take a more active role in feedback;
- Mid-module evaluation pitched to coursework;
- Lectures specifically pitched to coursework;

School-specific initiatives to support University employability strategies, including**:**
- The 'Working With Words' conference in liaison with UEA Careers Centre;
- The first year student conference (to replace the 'gap' left by removing examinations from Spring modules);
- Conference-type events built into the teaching of modules, especially at Level 6;
- Modules with an element of employability built in, most notably the 'I Am' (graduate identity) module and the more recent Working with Words module (to run 2016-17), but also the remit of the modules in Level 5 Options range B;
- Annual internships with FLY and with the Independent continue to provide good employability opportunities for skills developed on LDCs courses and modules - to date 8 students have been mentored on a Trainee Press Team, more than 24 internships have been secured with the Independent, and professional development feedback for another 60.
- A yearly internship with LDC's Publishing Project.

Module enrolment support, including:
- Reinstating student meetings with their adviser about module choices;
- A Blackboard site, LDC MODINFO (first developed in academic year 2012-13), which gives single and joint honours students significantly more information about modules than they can access via Evision, and is used by Course Directors in HUM schools with a literature element to their degree in their Enrolment briefings.

Improvement in turnaround times in 2015-16 as compared to 2014-15. The HoS has drawn up a School plan to be agreed at Autumn Board, and the School's TD has also promoted electronic marking as a measure which will help to improve turnaround further. We aspire to 100% in 2016-17.

Improved student engagement in **SSLC**, including a 30 minute student only pre-meeting to set the agenda, and an improvement in administrative support via the School office;

Introduction of a **prize for Literature dissertations** (pre-and post 1789) to bring recognition of achievement into line with Creative Writing.

Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	Last minute changes to the **pattern and length of the semester** have had a noticeably negative effect on student engagement and attendance, especially in the Spring semester. In addition, the instability of the teaching year interferes with pedagogically sound module design. **Inconsistent reading weeks** across the Faculty continue to impact negatively on joint degree students.

Student complaints regarding the **availability of module documentation** (module outlines and reading lists). The Blackboard site, LDC Module Information, can only go so far in solving this problem, in that the module outlines are the previous year's, and might be subject to change the following year. It doesn't help at all that students only receive confirmation of their modules in July or August (despite enrolling in March) and that LTS and ITCS timings are not synchronised: once students have their enrolments confirmed, they have to wait another two weeks before the Blackboard sites for their modules become available (allowing their tutor or convenor to give them the necessary information). August is just *too late* for students who want to get on top of their reading. Talis, meanwhile, has not had a significant uptake in the School (a) because it duplicates the functions of Blackboard, thereby both requiring academics to repeat work and introducing two sources of information and potential errors; (b) because it's not up to the task for modules which use databases of early modern texts; (c) because it returns students to the practices of A Level, and undermines the School's message about the purposes of reading and using criticism.

Exam board highlighted some inconsistencies in assessment **moderation practices** (modules not moderating the minimum of 10 pieces of work). This happened in part because the modules concerned were 'small' (12 -16 students) but also because there were instances where not enough work was submitted on time to constitute a 10-piece sample. The moderation policy needs some serious thought – it doesn't make sense to ask for a '10% or 10, whichever is the greater' sample from both a module with 12 students and a module with 300.

Consistency of feedback: guidance to new staff and to Associate Tutors about the minimum and maximum standards expected. Guidance on what should essentially be included in feedback has been provided to staff via optional templates, and in academic year 2016-17 the School plans to survey students asking them what kind of feedback they find most *helpful.*

Employability-rich modules represent specific challenges, in that it proves difficult in practice to retain academic rigour and discipline-specific skills alongside more vocational criteria. The School should learn from the experience of other Faculties, and in the meantime develop its own benchmarks, marking criteria, and support systems. |

Any University wide issues identified:	The meeting recorded significant concern at the steady **removal of optionality** on our Literature and Literature-related degrees. Q300 in particular is at risk of losing a crucial USP, which is worrying given the decline in admissions figures. The availability of choice on Literature degrees is what sets UEA apart from its competitors – *every* Literature degree above us in the League tables offers optionality, and makes that optionality prominent in their promotional literature. Optionality is also vital in retaining our students and ensuring that they report a positive student experience at the end of their degree. It's particularly telling that the removal of some modules on some Course Profiles has led to a rise in 'Variation to Course Profile' requests.
	The **Module enrolment process** is extremely important for student satisfaction and student retention, but it's administratively burdensome, and the timing of processes is ill suited to a School that needs its students to prepare and read over the summer. • Students select their modules in March, but are not informed of the outcome until mid-August. This is too late in the year for staff to inform them of the reading they need to do to prepare. • The TD's administrative work in this area has been vastly reduced thanks to the work of LTS colleagues. LTS have managed to identify problems early, and have streamlined the ways in which I receive information. Decisions have been considerably easier to make in 2015-16. • There have also been considerable improvements in the line of communication between Study Abroad and LTS. We'd like to thank them both for their enormous efforts in this area. • Would the University consider an automatic enrolment process, to bring us into the 21st century? Lots of other Universities use an online system.
	Problems with the **LTS policy** of **holding onto *all* student work on a large module** if one or more seminar batches are delayed. This was the case in 11 out of 39 cases, and has had a noticeably negative impact on NSS figures regarding the promptness of coursework return in LDC;
	Problems with the **LTS policy** of academics holding onto **uncollected student work**. Shifting an administrative role to academics does not solve the problem, although we imagine that electronic marking – where it is adopted – will.
	Problems with the **Extension policy,** most notably the **self-certification** policy, which has meant that academics hardly ever receive a full batch of work on time. It also creates confused expectations about coursework return amongst the student body;
	Administrative procedures – such as updating the Catalogue, updating Programme Specifications and updating Course Profiles,

	completing the Peer Observation Report, and indeed completing this Annual Course Review, are hindered by the very inefficiency of their design. Many of these procedures involve a to and fro of – or repetition of – information between administrators and academics to no useful end; many of them have been repeatedly tweaked to the point where it no longer remains clear who is to do what, or where the value of the procedure lies.
	This seems especially evident in the centralisation of the Module Evaluation process: where we had very high submission rates for Module Convenor's reports when the process was managed in-school, our submission rates have now plummeted.
	The catalogue update, programme specification updates and Course Profile updates are essential. Annual Course Reviews are essential *and* valuable. How can the University make this – and other administrative processes – less burdensome, less complicated, and more efficient?
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	Report to be produced and circulated by Q300 Course Director to staff by week 8 of Autumn semester.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	N/A for Literature Courses.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	School Teaching Day (June 2016 and June 2017). TD World Blackboard Site (ongoing)
Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)	
Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Prof Nick Selby Date: 17/xi/16
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	See above – continual reflection on pedagogical practice seems well embedded Move to single summative piece has precipitated wider review in school of thinking about assessment practices (effectiveness of school's efforts to improve timeliness of feedback should be noted) Numerous issues surrounding the admin process around QAR have been identified
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty	Via LTQC and will be fed into current Assessment and Feedback project

and University-proposed process and timescale.	

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	PPL	Year:2015/16	
Courses monitored and updated:	U1Q9N2301 CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION WITH BUSINESS MANAGEMENT U1LQ23302 CULTURE, LITERATURE AND POLITICS U1VQ53302/U2VQ53702 ENGLISH LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY U1RP1J402 FRENCH AND FILM AND TELEVISION STUDIES U1R9N2401 FRENCH LANGUAGE WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES U1R9N2403X FRENCH SPANISH DBLE HONS LANG WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES U1Q9N2302 INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION WITH BUSINESS MANAGEMENT U1L250302 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS U1L291302 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND EUROPEAN POLITICS U1LV2C302 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND MODERN HISTORY U1LT29401 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND MODERN LANGUAGES U1L290302 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICS U1TP23401/2 JAPANESE AND FILM AND TELEVISION U1R9N2401J/2J JAPANESE LANGUAGE WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES U1T2L9402 JAPANESE WITH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES U1PL32302 MEDIA AND POLITICS U1T901408 MODERN LANGUAGE U1T902304 MODERN LANGUAGE (3 YEAR) U1T90D401 MODERN LANGUAGE (DOUBLE HONOURS) U1RP9H403 MODERN LANGUAGE AND FILM AND TELEVISION U1R9L9403 MODERN LANGUAGE WITH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES			

	U1R9N2405 MODERN LANGUAGE WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES U1R9ND401 MODERN LANGUAGES WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES (DOUBLE HONOURS) U1T901402X/5X MODERN LANGUAGES: DOUBLE HONOURS (FRENCH/SPANISH) U1T901406X MODERN LANGUAGES: DOUBLE HONOURS (JAPANESE/FRENCH) U1T901401XS/2XS MODERN LANGUAGES: DOUBLE HONOURS LANGUAGE U1T901401/2 MODERN LANGUAGES: FRENCH U1T901402FA MODERN LANGUAGES: FRENCH (AB INITIO) U1T901401J/2J MODERN LANGUAGES: JAPANESE U1T901401H/2H MODERN LANGUAGES: SPANISH U1T901401HA/2HA MODERN LANGUAGES: SPANISH (AB INITIO) U1V500302 PHILOSOPHY U1VP53302 PHILOSOPHY AND FILM STUDIES U1VV51302 PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY U1LV25302 PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS U1L200301/2 POLITICS U1LP33301/2 SOCIETY, CULTURE AND MEDIA U1RP4J401 SPANISH AND FILM AND TELEVISION U1R4L7401 SPANISH HONOURS LANGUAGE WITH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT U1R9N2401H/2H SPANISH LANGUAGE WITH MANAGEMENT STUDIES U1Q9R8402XS TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING WITH DOUBLE HONOURS LANGUAGE U1Q9R8401/4 TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING WITH DOUBLE HONOURS LANGUAGE (FRENCH AND SPANISH) U1Q9R8407 TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING WITH MODERN LANGUAGES (DOUBLE HONOURS) U1RP43401 TRANSLATION MEDIA AND SPANISH U1RP13401/2 TRANSLATION, MEDIA AND FRENCH U1RP13402FA TRANSLATION, MEDIA AND FRENCH (AB INITIO) U1QP9J401/2 TRANSLATION, MEDIA AND JAPANESE U1QP9H403 TRANSLATION, MEDIA AND MODERN LANGUAGE U1QP9D401 TRANSLATION, MEDIA AND MODERN LANGUAGES (DOUBLE HONOURS) U1RP93401 TRANSLATION, MEDIA WITH FRENCH AND SPANISH U1T901V01 VISITING STUDIES IN MODERN LANGUAGE & EUROPEAN STUDIES (UNDERGRADUATE) U1V500V01 VISITING STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY (UNDERGRADUATE) U1L200V01 VISITING STUDIES IN POLITICAL SOCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (UNDERGRADUATE)
Summary of good practice and action plans:	The QAR1 forms which have so far been completed indicate that the modules reviewed in 2015-16 were very favourably received by students. There are consistent reports in the forms of high/very high marks being awarded by students for quality of teaching, interesting

	and engaging subject matter, satisfaction with assessment arrangements (marking, feedback, and the mix of summative and formative tasks), availability of library and other learning resources, etc. Module organisers appear to be using formative assessment in particularly interesting and intellectually challenging ways. Those forms which mention student achievement tend to report that students performed strongly (with high percentages achieving marks reflective of good honours), which seems to be at least partly due to the assessment strategies being used.
	A further element of good practice is the evident willingness of module organisers to reflect constructively on student evaluations, and to use students' suggestions for improvements as a basis for updating their modules before they are next offered. This is apparent in the QAR1 forms for a number of modules. It is clear that module organisers have also used this process as a way of thinking about their modules more generally, and how they can be further improved.
	A notable feature of the QAR1 forms is that none of them comment on students being unhappy with the timescales for return of assessed work. PPL almost achieved 100% compliance with the 20-working-day policy in 2015-16, and returned work on average in under 15 working days, which seems to have played a role in changing students' perceptions of how promptly they receive feedback.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	The QAR1 forms don't reveal any specific, substantive issues which would need to be addressed at school level, or any problems which would suggest the need for recommendations and changes. Suggestions for improvement are minor and are confined to the module level, and are already being borne in mind and acted on by the module organisers concerned. The key issues arising from the QAR1 forms are the clear levels of satisfaction among students with the aspects of their modules as indicated above, and the imaginative assessment strategies used, and these will continue to be discussed further at school and sector level, and hopefully further improvements made. One forum for these conversations will be the Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment (which is PPL is the focus of an annual Teaching Away Day) at which good practice will be disseminated within the school.
Any University wide issues identified:	None evident, although it is noticeable that response rates for student module evaluations are consistently low, and any reports based on them are limited by the number of students whose feedback is included. This is presumably a university-wide issue. Part of PPL (philosophy) are returning to module evaluation via hard-copy, with evaluation forms completed in class, rather than allowing students to evaluate modules via evision in the coming year as a pilot. It is hoped that this might improve response rates.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year	The modules reviewed in 2016-17 will be the ones which activate any of the usual triggers for review. Some of these may be ones which were reviewed in 2015-16 (for example, if the module organiser has changed). But none of the modules reviewed in 2015-

following the monitoring and update process:	16 will be reviewed again in 2016-17 as a result of any substantive issues arising from the monitoring process itself.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None. There are no modules which include placements, although there are some which contain professional practice components or internships. None of these modules were reviewed in 2015-16.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	There are ongoing opportunities for elements of good pedagogic practice to be disseminated at school and sector meetings, and the Teaching Away Day in May/June is a regular, annual event at which the school reflects at length on approaches to teaching, including those which have worked successfully on specific modules in the previous year.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Prof Nick Selby
	Date: 17/xi/16
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	See above – continual reflection on pedagogical practice seems well embedded Some issues surrounding the admin process around QAR have been identified – especially low numbers of student module evaluations being completed
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	Via LTQC and will be fed into current Assessment and Feedback project

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught
(delete as appropriate)
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>Year:2015/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses monitored and updated:</td>
<td colspan="3">ALL AMA UG COURSES

U1V3P1302; U1V350302
U2V35070;U1V354401;U1VQ32304; U1WV63302;U1V2L2302;U1V2L2401;U1V3P1302;U1V230301;U1V238403;U1V0L0302;U1V0L0X402;U1V2L2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of good practice and action plans:</td>
<td colspan="3">Action plans:

<u>Module content and students' workload</u>: Across all 3 departments module organisers suggested that some modules had attempted to cover too much ground. At the same time, several module organisers reported that students had felt that expectations with regards to independent study (especially reading) were too high. All module organisers who commented on these issues put plans in place to make module content more manageable and to communicate expectations more clearly to students.

<u>Summative assessments</u>: In particular in FTM students seemed dissatisfied with assessment strategies. On several modules students asked for more than one piece of summative assessment and module organisers reported that a reduction of summative work needs to be accompanied by an increase in communication about assessments. The School is conducting a review of its assessment and feedback strategies and we will discuss the pedagogic purposes and benefits of different assessment strategies at School level. Until we have concluded this review, we are not expecting significant changes to existing assessment strategies on individual modules.

Good practice:</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Action plans suggest that all module organisers reflect on student feedback and adjust assessment and teaching strategies where necessary.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	In 2015/16, the school lacked a coordinated approach to its review of modules and courses. There were several changes in role holders (e.g. teaching director, course directors, head of school) and changes in staff (2015/16 module organisers left the university). To help assure that the School has detailed information about all modules and clear action plans, the School executive has agreed that in 2016/17 all departments will hold minuted module and course review meetings. In addition, to help the School gather more detailed information about its approach to module design and assessment and feedback, it will conduct a mid-semester review across all courses.
Any University wide issues identified:	
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	Please see the list of modules submitted to LTS. Modules where module organisers identified plans for changes (assessment or module content) will be included in next year's review, due to staff members' probationary status, changes in module organisers, or large numbers of associate tutors on the module. Students on all AMA modules will be invited to submit feedback on their modules at the end of the semester.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	n/a
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process	The review of modules suggests that all module organisers reflect on student feedback, which is good practice. Reflection on student learning and feedback is an ongoing process (so no specific timescale can be given here), but the department wide module and course review meetings (to be held after the summer exam boards) will be an opportunity for departments to come together and reflect on issues arising across modules and courses.

and timescale:	
Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)	
Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Prof Nick Selby
	Date: 17/xi/16
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	See above – continual reflection on pedagogical practice seems well embedded Numerous issues surrounding the admin process around QAR have been identified
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	Via LTQC and will be fed into current Assessment and Feedback project

2015/16 Undergraduate Annual Module and Course Review: Issues for University Wide Consideration raised in QAR3 forms

SCI

School	Issue	LTC Response	Action
BIO	**Teaching resources** The majority of BIO courses are increasingly popular and recruited record high UG student numbers for 2016-17. In short, we are moving to a position where we have approximately 150-180 more students registered in BIO at any one time than we did three or four years ago. To maintain SSR we will thus need at least 10 more academic staff than we had four years ago. We made five new ATR 3 appointments this year and one member of academic staff left (to become Dean of FMH), a net gain of 4. We are thus at least 6 academic members of staff below the level required to get SSR back to where it was 3 or 4 years ago (14-15 students per staff fte) The School has on-going efforts to revise some practices associated with coursework marking. These include: 1. Using Local Support to collect, distribute and return coursework, monitor progress and remind markers of approaching deadlines, inform HoS and DLT of incomplete marking approaching 15-daydeadline. HoS and DLT managing the process to ensure 20-day deadline compliance. All BIO coursework was returned within 20 days in 2015-16. 2. Encouraging colleagues to share marking and spread out deadlines. 3. Encouraging colleagues to put coursework deadlines and marking time into diaries. 4. Encouraging colleagues to employ group marking sessions. 5. Encouraging colleagues to consider Associate Tutors for marking (where appropriate and resource is available). 6. Encouraging colleagues to reduce assessment (fewer items, reduced volume) where appropriate. 7. Encouraging colleagues to use more efficient assessment, e.g. online tests and *pro formas*.		

	8. Encouraging colleagues to use more efficient means teaching support, e.g. module blogs to reduce email. 9. Expanded use of electronic marking via Blackboard. Some of these practices may help us cope with some of the demands of increased numbers but there is a limit to which efficiency can be improved without negatively impacting the student learning experience. BIO has seen downward trending scores for most indicators in NSS over the past couple of years, especially in the 2015-16 survey. There is a brutal inevitability to this as staff resource becomes increasingly stretched. It is very hard to imagine how the School can reverse the decline in student learning experience without increased human resource to deliver teaching and assessment. Put simply, we need more lecturers. **Module Evaluation** For each and every one of our modules for response rates in on-line the student evaluation exercise is far too low there to be confidence in the scores. Please see Nulty DD, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 33,No. 3, June 2008, 301–314 for discussion of the response rates required. Other institutions are abandoning online evaluation and returning to paper based evaluation as consequence of the same low engagement with online methods. It would be appropriate for UEA to consider the same solution.		
CHE	The University system for **holding module level information** is unsatisfactory. It has been constant struggle to maintain a single point of truth for information relevant to modules. The hub must respect the primacy of the module outline and use this information, not simply rolling over the year before as their source. Any additional information required by the hub or the school managers must be integrated. Holding the information as a word file and abstracting it through mail merging and spreadsheets is wasting		

	huge amounts of time and inviting divergence. We urgently need a database driven system with a facile but secure data entry system. The current system is not only wasteful but it is often the cause of minor inconsistencies and may well become the cause of major inconsistencies we will live to regret. Aspects like reading lists cannot be managed through recommendations and preferences. Academics need clear guidelines and instructions or nothing will be implemented. The **Universities IT (wifi) infrastructure** is inadequate for the BYOD active learning pedagogies we would like to introduce in CHE. This is a particular shame for the new Physics degree, where both the new lecturers are keen.		
ENV	Continued disconnect between **QA review process and LTS Module and Course update** remains inefficient and imposes a cost on staff time of research active ATR faculty. Directors of courses spanning faculties (e.g. EGID) continue to experience problems due to the failure of the institution to implement a consistent **timetabling policy** and process across faculties.		
NAT	The issue of timetable clashes as a result of **out of slot teaching** continues to cause problems for Natural sciences students. This can have a significant effect on module choice.		
PHA	Appropriate **teaching spaces** for workshop activities or Team based learning (TBL) across the university are difficult to secure		

Title: *SCI LTQC QAR 3s (UG)*
Author: Karin Goodby
Date: 17 November 2016
Circulation: List of recipients
Agenda: Learning and Teaching Committee – 30 November 2016
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

To receive the 2015-16 QAR 3s (UG) from SCI LTQC.

Recommendation

None.

Resource Implications

None.

Risk Implications

None.

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

Contact details: Karin Goodby, Learning and Teaching Coordinator, telephone 01603 593505, email: k.goodby@uea.ac.uk, for any queries/further information relating to this document.

Background

N/A

Discussion

N/A

Attachments
QAR 3s UG (BIO, CHE, ENV, NAT, PHA)

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School: BIO		Year: 2015-16	
Courses monitored and updated:	U1C10C402 BIOL SCIENCES WITH A YEAR ABROAD U1C103401 Biol Sciences with a Year in Australasia U1C101401 Biol Sciences with a Year in Europe U1C102401 Biol Sciences with a Year in North America U1C18A402 ECOLOGY WITH A YEAR ABROAD U1C183401 Ecology with a Year in Europe U1C100302 – Biological Sciences U2C100602 – Biological Sciences U1C100V01 - Visiting Studies In Biological Sciences (Undergraduate) BIO/U1C104402 – Biological Sciences With A Year In Industry BIO/U1C104401 – pre 2013 U1C201401 – Plant Sciences MSci U1C700302 – Biochemistry U2C700602 – Biochemistry BIO/U1C720402 – Biochemistry With A Year In Industry BIO/U1C720401 – Biochemistry With A Year In Industry U1C930302 – Biomedicine U1C930301 – Biomedicine - PRE 2013 U1C501401 – Microbiology (MSci) U1C501402 – Microbiology (MSci) (BIM) U18C91401 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES WITH A FOUNDATION YEAR		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	We have significantly improved coursework turnaround times over the last academic year but with student number increase greatly outpacing increase in staff number (see below) it is unclear if this can be maintained. We are increasingly adopting online emarking using Blackboard. This was the theme of the BIO Learning and Teaching Day and has been a discussed extensively with colleagues both there and at School meetings.		

	In 2015-16 year DLT introduced a newsletter to keep staff informed of developments in all aspects of teaching. this has been very well received by colleagues.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	Review of assessment items that require students to complete more than 100 words per 1% of assessment (BIO-5006A (002), BIO-6003A (001) and BIO-6013A (001 and 002) Anonymised Question by Question mark sheets to be uploaded to the BIO Faculty Blackboard site. MO to review of 4001A and 4002B exams because of low performance BIO-M82Y assessment pattern contains a participation element – to be reviewed by MO BIO-M204 assessment marks are very high and are exactly the same for two components – to be reviewed by MO BIO-4001A portfolio assessment workload – to be discussed by Teaching Committee Moderation of Level 4 exam scripts – proposal to be considered further and Teaching Committee to discuss.
Any University wide issues identified:	**Teaching resources** The majority of BIO courses are increasingly popular and recruited record high UG student numbers for 2016-17, exceeding the record numbers in the previous year. We appear to be moving from 150-180 students per level to 220-240 students per level. We have seen increased UG numbers every year from 2009-10 (Table 1) **Table 1. BIO student, staff and SSR numbers.** Student number data for 2009-10 to 2015-16 from Census, data for 2016-17 from Tableau, accessed 14 October 2016. *Note that only one of the new ATR 3 appointments is currently in place.

	2009-10 Oct 5th	2010-11 Oct 12th	2011-12 Oct 10th	2012-13 Oct 8th	2013-14 Oct 4th	2014-15 Oct 6th	2015-16 Oct 5th	2016-17 Oct
UG students	459.5	482	484	506	567	584	631	679
UG + PGT students	515	542	553	563	610	626	666	745
UG + PGT + PGR students	568	610	619	622	676	696	735	N/A
Teaching staff (fte)	38.50	37.75	45.05	44.65	46.45	42.95	45.45	45.45*
SSR (UG+PGT)	13.38	14.36	12.28	12.61	13.13	14.58	14.65	16.39
SSR (UG + PGT + PGR)	14.75	16.16	13.74	13.93	14.55	16.20	16.17	N/A

In short, we are moving to a position where we have approximately 150-180 more students registered in BIO at any one time than we did three or four years ago. To maintain SSR we will thus need at least 10 more academic staff

	than we had four years ago. We made five new ATR 3 appointments this year and one member of academic staff left (to become Dean of FMH), a net gain of 4. We are thus at least 6 academic members of staff below the level required to get SSR back to where it was 3 or 4 years ago (14-15 students per staff fte)
	The School has on-going efforts to revise some practices associated with coursework marking. These include:
	1. Using Local Support to collect, distribute and return coursework, monitor progress and remind markers of approaching deadlines, inform HoS and DLT of incomplete marking approaching 15-day deadline. HoS and DLT managing the process to ensure 20-day deadline compliance. All BIO coursework was returned within 20 days in 2015-16.
	2. Encouraging colleagues to share marking and spread out deadlines.
	3. Encouraging colleagues to put coursework deadlines and marking time into diaries.
	4. Encouraging colleagues to employ group marking sessions.
	5. Encouraging colleagues to consider Associate Tutors for marking (where appropriate and resource is available).
	6. Encouraging colleagues to reduce assessment (fewer items, reduced volume) where appropriate.
	7. Encouraging colleagues to use more efficient assessment, e.g. online tests and *pro formas*.
	8. Encouraging colleagues to use more efficient means teaching support, e.g. module blogs to reduce email.
	9. Expanded use of electronic marking via Blackboard.
	Some of these practices may help us cope with some of the demands of increased numbers but there is a limit to which efficiency can be improved without negatively impacting the student learning experience.
	BIO has seen downward trending scores for most indicators in NSS over the past couple of years, especially in the 2015-16 survey. There is a brutal inevitability to this as staff resource becomes increasingly stretched. It is very hard to imagine how the School can reverse the decline in student learning experience without increased human resource to deliver teaching and assessment. Put simply, we need more lecturers.
	Module Evaluation
	For each and every one of our modules for response rates in on-line the student evaluation exercise is far too low there to be confidence in the scores. Please see Nulty DD, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 33, No. 3, June 2008, 301–314 for discussion of the response rates required. Other institutions are abandoning online evaluation and returning to paper-based evaluation as consequence of the same low engagement with online methods. It would be appropriate for UEA to consider the same solution.
Modules requiring review in	BIO-4001A

subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	Teaching newsletter – monthly School meetings – 9 per year School L&T Day – annually (September)

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *David Stevens*
	Date: 18th Nov 2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	Significant reduction in coursework turnaround time following difficulties in previous years. Increased use of electronic marking. School internal newsletter on Teaching and Learning issues. The significance and usefulness of the existing module evaluation process is questioned.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale.	QAR3 forms discussed at Faculty LTQC and LTC.

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* **For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)**			
School:	CHE	Year:	2015-16
Courses monitored and updated:	Chemistry BSc, Chemistry with a Foundation Year BSc, MChem Chemistry (also years in industry and year abroad), MChem Forensic and Investigative Chemistry, Science with a Foundation Year, BSc Chemical Physics, MChem Chemical Physics (Industry & Year abroad), BSc Biological and Medicinal Chemistry, BSc Biological and Medicinal Chemistry (also years in industry and year abroad)		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	(1) Continue to work with the module organisers of all module that do not meet a 65% mean mark threshold to ensure the teaching and assessment is appropriate for a top sixth department. (2) Enforce a zero tolerance policy towards tutorial and laboratory absence. (3) The employability director will liaise with module organisers to further embed commercial awareness in the degree. (4) Trial dialogue+ feedback discussion on CHE-5301B. (5) Review the effectiveness of HoY in distributing coursework across the year. (6) Embrace and promote week 7, semester 2 as "do something different week". (7) Work with careers to further assist our students with the highly competitive process of finding placements.		
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	The school has made great strides this year, moving from 60% to 70% of our students achieving a 2(i) or above. However, there are still too many BSc students not reaching this level. The zero-tolerance policy towards tutorial attendance is intended to address the engagement element of poor performance and pave the way for additional small group teaching.		
Any University wide issues identified:	The University system for holding module level information is unsatisfactory. It has been constant struggle to maintain a single point of truth for information relevant to modules. The hub must respect the primacy of the module outline and use this information, not simply rolling over the year before as their source. Any additional information		

	required by the hub or the school managers must be integrated. Holding the information as a word file and abstracting it through mail merging and spreadsheets is wasting huge amounts of time and inviting divergence. We urgently need a database driven system with a facile but secure data entry system. The current system is not only wasteful but it is often the cause of minor inconsistencies and may well become the cause of major inconsistencies we will live to regret. Aspects like reading lists cannot be managed through recommendations and preferences. Academics need clear guidelines and instructions or nothing will be implemented. The Universities IT (wifi) infrastructure is inadequate for the BYOD active learning pedagogies we would like to introduce in CHE. This is a particular shame for the new Physics degree, where both the new lecturers are keen.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	**Modules Reviewed in 2015-16 to be reviewed again in 2016-17:** CHE- 4701Y CHE-5101A CHE-5150Y CHE-5201Y CHE-5202Y CHE-5301B CHE-5501Y CHE-5601Y CHE-5701Y CHE-6001Y CHE-6002Y CHE-6020Y CHE-6021Y CHE-6022Y CHE-6023Y CHE-6024Y CHE-6101Y CHE-6201Y CHE-6250Y CHE-6301Y CHE-6601Y **New Modules which we have asked to be reviewed:** CHE-6350Y CHE-7001Y CHE-7101Y CHE-7150Y CHE-7201Y CHE-7250Y CHE-7301Y CHE-7350Y CHE-7601Y CHE-7701Y

Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	Students on placement have completed these successfully and in nearly all cases describe this experience as highly beneficial. Obtaining placements for the Year 2 cohort has continued to been a challenge this year. Advertised placements (e.g. through RSC Jobs) are receiving large numbers of applications. This is a popular type of degree nationally such that obtaining a placement is highly competitive. On the positive side developments in Careers have resulted in the identification and advertisment of more placement positions. The students do not lack for positions to apply to. Engagement in the application process is an issue for some. Another issue is that students are not being offered positions after interview. With Careers we are hopefully improving this aspect of the application process.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	The Hos and DoLT in chemistry share a very positive philosophy of acknowledging and sharing good practice within the school. Teaching matters are disseminated and discussed at executive and school meetings. The teaching committee has very extensive membership, greater than a third of the academic staff, and is an excellent platform for shaping and refining practice. We work hard to ensure good practice is introduced immediately wherever possible and through the annual review process where necessary. See action plan.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	*David Stevens*
	Date: 18th Nov 2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	The school is taking positive action to enhance and enforce engagement with key academic activities such as laboratory sessions and tutorials. I would like to reiterate the plea for an improved process for collection and use of module information. The current method of filling in Microsoft Office documents and cutting and pasting information into other systems is not fit for purpose. It wastes time for both academics and professional services and leads to inaccuracies, errors and inconsistencies. An integrated online system would have a widespread positive impact for students and staff right across the university and should be a priority.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	QAR3 forms discussed at Faculty LTQC and LTC.

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	ENV	Year:	2015-2016
Courses monitored and ==updated==:	UG course listed below have been subject to 2015-16 Annual QAR2 Review. [NB: None of these have been updated as, perversely, that is an entirely separate process. Therefore I do not understand this question here on the QAR3 form.] 8F90401 Environmental Sciences with a Foundation Year U1FF97302 - Meteorology And Oceanography U1FF97301 - Meteorology And Oceanography - PRE 2013 U1F790402 - Meteorology And Oceanography (Msci) U1F790401 - Meteorology And Oceanography (Msci) - PRE 2013 U1FF8A402 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year Abroad U1FF8R401 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year In Australasia - PRE 2013 U1FFX7401 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year In Europe - PRE 2013 U1FFY7401 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year In North America - PRE 2013 U1FF87402 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year In Industry U1FF87401 - Meteorology And Oceanography With A Year In Industry - PRE 2013 U1F647402 - Environmental Earth Science (Msci) U1F647401 - Environmental Earth Science (Msci) - PRE 2013 U1F630302 - Environmental Earth Sciences U1F630301 - Environmental Earth Sciences - PRE 2013 U1F64A402 - Environmental Earth Sciences With A Year Abroad U1F645402 - Environmental Earth Sciences With A Year In Industry BSc Geography U1FL87302 - Environmental Geography and International Development		

	Courses for which QAR2 annual course review was not available: Environmental Sciences Environmental Geography with Climate Change Environmental Geophysics
Summary of good practice and action plans:	• A greater retention of students on the ENV FY to ENV courses is desirable, small changes in the ENV-0001Y module aim to tailor to student interest in Ecology to demonstrate opportunities in ENV and improve retention of students in the School. This will be evaluated as the number of students who remain in ENV at Level 4 compared to those on the ENV FY, aiming for 100% completion, and 100% transfer/progression to ENV at Level 4. • Continuing to develop more M&O cohort activities (Course Director, throughout 2016/7). • Continuing the process of getting M&O degree course accredited by IMarEST (Course Director, 2016/2017). • Improving the numbers of M&O student intake (Course Director and the whole sector, 2016/17) • F630 team will formulate an action plan as they undertake the Quinquennial review. • U1FL87302 - To circumvent the clashing of the most popular optional modules where possible and to continue using the EGID Blackboard as a single source of information from both Schools (the Blackboard is a great benefit to both students and staff)
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	Rules on assessments (10 day turn-around, moderation practice, use of feedback templates, rules on submission dates to reduce bunching) developed by Env LTC were disseminated via a School Assessment Manual (revised version published to faculty Bb ENV Teaching guide site, Oct 2016). Chair of Examiners reviewed submission deadlines to ensure compliance.
Any University wide issues identified:	Continued disconnect between QA review process and LTS Module and Course update remains inefficient and imposes a cost on staff time of research active ATR faculty. Directors of courses spanning faculties (e.g. EGID) continue to experience problems due to the failure of the institution to implement a consistent timetabling policy and process across faculties.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	None identified by QAR2. Continue to trigger according to LTS tracker codes (new module, probationary staff, etc.) and any additional SSLC concerns.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None identified in QAR2s. Issues have recently arisen with summer vacation fieldcourses where

	year in industry students are then already on their placement but subject to semester cw deadlines. In future students will be asked to defer starting their placement to accommodate fieldcourse CW deadline.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	Good practice is currently disseminated via resources on Staff ENV Teaching guide Blackboard site. 16 November 2016 – assessment masterclass with Prof Phil Race on effective, efficient and excellent assessment. 11 January 2017 School Away Day – teaching discussions

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: David Stevens
	Date: 18th Nov 2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	The Meteorology and Oceanography Degree programme did secure accreditation from IMarEST who were very complimentary about both School and University Quality Assurance. Working with colleagues in LTS to ensure that key cross school/faculty modules are properly slotted to ensure coherent academic choice.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	QAR3 forms discussed at Faculty LTQC and LTC.

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* **For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)**			
School:	NAT	Year:	2015.16
Courses monitored and updated:	BSc Natural Sciences (and year abroad and year in industry variant) MNatSci Natural sciences		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	Nothing significant to report. Good honours continue to be very good.		
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	There will some changes to modules as a result of a couple of year 2 modules moving to year 1 to fit the new physics degree. Nothing to report about assessment or moderation.		
Any University wide issues identified:	The issue of timetable clashes as a result of out of slot teaching continues to cause problems for Natural sciences students. This can have a significant effect on module choice.		
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	None. The new module in year 1 is all current teaching material.		
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None.		
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process	The NAT team meet on a regular basis.		

and timescale:	
Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)	
Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: David Stevens
	Date: 18th Nov 2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale.	QAR3 forms discussed at Faculty LTQC and LTC.

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	Pharmacy	Year:	2015-16
Courses monitored and updated:	MPharm MPharm with placement Pharmacy with Foundation year BSc Pharmaceutical Sciences Visiting Students (Science without Borders)		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	Learning and teaching innovations in 2015/16: • Lecture capture adopted widely across the school with positive feedback from students • TBL delivery increased, is now delivered not only in year 3, but also year 2 and 4, general with positive student feedback about the teaching method, particularly the integrated TBL in level 2 worked well • A further reduction in labreports and instead a re-focussing on skills in year 2 was performed • Improved clarity of marking and student expectations in written examinations has improved performance across the course • The community placement programme has been re-designed and now delivers a two week placement at the end of the second year • New MPharm year 4 was delivered, in general the response from student was positive, however the CNS module needs redesigning • The assessment burden in professional practice modules has been reduced Action plan for 2016-17 • Begin curriculum redesign in preparation to launch a new course in 2017/18, therefore have course outlined by May 2017 • Increase the proportion of staff and teaching events that focus on active learning • Rework the CNS module for level 4 • Introduce a more focussed exam review process		
Summary of	• Continue using the new GPhC style MCQ questions in all		

Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	clinical therapeutics topics to help prepare students for the GPhC assessment • Change the exam preparation and review process to cut down on mistakes on exams
Any University wide issues identified:	Appropriate teaching spaces for workshop activities or Team based learning (TBL) across the university are difficult to secure
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	PHA-0001Y: R-PS PHAP4006Y (First two years of module, R-PS) PHAP4007 (First two years of module, new module organiser, R-PS) PHAP4003Y (First two years of module) PHAP4008 (First two years of module) PHA-4004Y: R-SC PHA-5004Y (New module organiser) PHA-5002Y (New module organiser, R-PS) PHA-5004Y: (New module organiser) PHA-6006Y (New module organiser) PHA-7003B (New module organiser, R-PS) PHA-7001B (First two years of module, new module organiser) PHA-7005A (First two years of module)
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	• A significant number of community placement hosts training on consultation skills to improve the quality of placement experience
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	• Teaching developments and good practice disseminated at School away day • School board to highlight and disseminate good practice and experiences of novel teaching throughout the academic year

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *David Stevens*
	Date: 18th Nov 2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	Widespread use of lecture capture within the school to positive effect. Use of Team Based Learning to positive effect, however note that appropriate spaces for such activities are difficult to secure.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale.	QAR3 forms discussed at Faculty LTQC and LTC.

2015/16 Undergraduate Annual Module and Course Review: Issues for University Wide Consideration raised in QAR3 forms

SSF

School	Issue	LTC Response	Action
ECO	• There are continued concerns over **the quality of teaching spaces**. There are too many failures of equipment and too much variation in the quality of individual rooms. Moreover, any additional investment in technology by Faculty staff to further enhance student engagement is under significant threat. • The use **of study plus/revision week**, together with the higher time costs associated with the reassessment period, increases pressures on module convenors. This could be considered for work allocation models.		
DEV	Our use of **a new feedback form**, based on a form used in NBS, has proved very successful. It has been well received by students and is likely to be the main factor behind the large rise in our NSS scores in 2016-17. This is certainly something worth sharing within the Faculty and UEA more broadly. Our experience in DEV with **year-long, 40 credit modules** also may have wider relevance for the Faculty and University. We found that these modules were not popular with staff or students. Students felt it restricted their choices and meant a very stressful final exam in the summer, covering the whole year. Staff found it more difficult to co-ordinate the inevitably larger teaching teams and to ensure coherence in teaching methods and content between the two semesters. Overall we feel that single-semester 20 credit modules work much better. One final point – to help build links with the BA/BSc Geography degrees taught in ENV, and take advantage of potential overlaps		

	and synergies with our own BA Geography and International Development, we would welcome any steps taken by UEA toward greater standardisation of **timetabling systems** used by different Faculties.		
EDU	The main issues identified by the various **EDU UG courses relate to working with or interaction with the LTS Hub**. These issues include, but are not limited to, the following: course directors and course teams receiving mixed messages in relation to procedures and/or rule changes; a lack of communication in some instances; problems with timetabling; problems with room booking; and problems with the SITS 'system'. Although it must be noted that most of these issues have improved from the previous year. **Staffing** has also been an issue for the UG courses (e.g. replacing staff that have left with permanent appointments rather than through associate tutor contacts – in relation to the student experience).		
LAW	**Self-certification procedure** - negatively impacts on the marking and moderation process when too low a number of students have submitted work within the 20 day turn around period. - hinder module organisers from adopting innovative forms of assessment, particularly assessments to be completed in short periods of time. - impact detrimentally on the courses' goals of preparing students for a professional environment in which failure to meet deadlines is a competency issue and of profound consequence to clients. In addition, the lack of scrutiny of self-certification to ensure at least wording in compliance with grounds specified in the regulations		

does not contribute to developing students' professionalism, with a negative impact on their employability.

Remaking requests for summative assessment

- The procedure fails to take into account that the first marker and moderator are the subject specialists and that the School may not have a third member of faculty who is able to competently comment on the assessment

- external examiners do not appear to be not notified that results which they have agreed are being altered following a remark, even when the student paper in question may have been included in the sample sent to the external examiner (a third specialist in the area – in which case, why allow the student to ask for a 4th person to mark the paper when the mark has been agreed by three separate, competent people?)

- There is no scrutiny of the grounds for requesting a remark of summative coursework which may be based on weak grounds, when the onus should be on the student to demonstrate why they should be able to call into question a decision reached in accordance with the formal marking and moderation process,

20 day turn around period for marking summative coursework

- impacts on the format of summative coursework set rather than it being based purely on pedagogic grounds

- Impacts on the ability of faculty to provide the individual level of feedback/feedforward desired by both staff and students.

	- fails to take into account the number of faculty able to mark on a particular module in relation to the number of students, given the high level of specialism required to undertake the marking **Lack of teaching space and the poor quality of some teaching rooms** - This significantly affects the student learning experience, something which the School is held accountable for through eg the NSS, but over which we have no control - The School is very concerned about the coming year and the continued use of eg Blackdale and the use in the coming year of the Sportspark (will the students have sufficient desk space, will the temporary set-up for the IT always work properly, will students be able to access the building without a campus card as they do other teaching rooms etc) - The School will not consider itself as accountable for these issues in 2016/17 nor for its impact on the NSS results **Examinations** - there is insufficient time given to markers of examinations scheduled at the end of the examination period. It assumes that markers will mark over the weekend in order to meet the deadline - the details of the reassessment exam timetable is published very late in the academic year, giving module organisers very short notice as to when their exams will take place (particularly compared to how early module organisers must submit their reassessment exam papers to the Exams Office – the same		

	amount of time is not given in return to module organisers as to when the exams will take place) **Administrative support** - There is insufficient administrative support for teaching and teaching-related activities. Colleagues in both the Arts HUB and Study Abroad Office are overstretched and have to function in very cramped working conditions.		
NBS	University to encourage other schools to develop **TEF Readiness Plans.**		
PSY	**Teaching room crisis** The major issue to be addressed at University level is the room situation which has become progressively worse over recent years during a time of significant growth in Psychology and other SSF Schools. The lack of suitable teaching accommodation creates stress within the administrative process and negatively impacts upon both teaching quality and the student experience. **Defined choice of out of School modules** The process of defined choice is not easy to operate and does not maximise the potential for students to explore modules outside of their core programme. The institution would benefit from a review of this process so that more students could benefit from interdisciplinary experience. **Maintaining a relationship with students post-graduation.**		

	The current process of graduates being required to use the alumni office to maintain a UEA e-mail contact is inefficient and has a low take up. Students graduate and UEA immediately removes their IT access. This sends an instant message that their relationship with the University is terminated. Maintaining contact with students starts to occur on an ad hoc basis and there is no way to maintain contact with whole cohorts – despite many potential employment opportunities needing to be publicised to graduates. The University should review the process of how we maintain contact and nurture relationships with graduates. We are considering School solutions to this issue, but it would be more efficient for the University to manage this as a whole.		
SWK	Issues arising at the 2 SSLC meetings: • Students were concerned about **changes in the times of the park and ride buses** as students risked being late for lectures. The Senior Advisor (Yvonne Johnson at the time) liaised with the Union of Students. • **Inadequate room sizes** was raised as an issue by students. The University-wide Working Group looking into teaching rooms said that they would attempt rectify this. The School hopes to some limited priority bookings once again next year.		

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate Taught			
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	Economics	Year: 2015/16	
Courses monitored and updated:	All undergraduate programmes: U1L100V01; U1L100303; T1L101101; U1L10A401; U1L111303; U1NL41302; U1L1N4303; U1L0V0302; U1LL12303.		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	Good Practice 1. The School continues to be at the forefront of the use of technology in teaching. This year we successfully trialled on-line marking, further invested in a range of audience response systems, innovated in e-learning and adopted numerous Web 2.0 tools. This subsequently led to a Faculty workshop to disseminate information on assessment ("Steering Summative, Framing Formative: A Practical Guide into HE Assessment Practices"; May 17th). 2. There has been further investment in the employability support that the School provides. This includes substantial funding for ECO-specific interns (14 undergraduate), employability inductions (including returning students) and continued improvements in ECO-specific employability training events. 3. The creation of a teaching organisation, Ecuator, has enabled further dissemination of teaching practices across the School. Linked to the Economic Network at a national level, this also gives Economics at UEA greater influence in the teaching of Economics across the Higher Education sector. 4. The School used student questionnaires at both Level 4 and 5 to improve on assessment & feedback practices. This also involved consideration of practices across the Faculty, illustrating the value of inter-School dissemination of information. 5. The School introduced a student-run teaching award scheme, rewarding staff excellence in assessment and feedback.		

	Action Plans
	1. Given concerns over 'good honours' outcomes but also the need to avoid inappropriate grade inflation, the School is considering the creation of new modules. This will allow further innovations in assessment methods and enables pathways consistent with the diversity in student skills. This includes a dissertation module, highlighted in SSLC and by previous external examiner, as a means to further promote specific learning outcomes. 2. The School is considering proposals to improve the portfolio of courses offered. To promote continuation of study to our postgraduate schemes, the School will look at the introduction of an additional ECO-specific scheme. In addition, the School will look at widening 'Year Abroad' opportunities beyond L100. Currently students are inefficiently forced to transfer from other schemes to benefit from this opportunity. 3. There will be a review of existing modules and consideration over how to incorporate further employability (e.g. Liaise between Careers and ECO employability team to consider how businesses can contribute to the curricula for the new module, The Economics of Business Decision Making). 4. Continue to invest in our transitions events (e.g. revise Contemporary Economic Issues to include greater variation in student, academic, employer and careers content), liaising in particular with the Economics Society. 5. Monitor progress of the first cohort of students benefitting from the Year Abroad opportunity.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	The 'Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment' provided a vehicle to highlight the advantages of using systems such as 'Talis'. Recommendations focused on three key aspects: 1. <u>Good Honours Outcomes</u> The School acknowledges that, while there have been improvements in this performance indicator over time, there are significant opportunities to make further progress. Maintaining the quality of its marking systems and avoiding any issues associated with inappropriate mark inflation, the recommendations include: • Consider the breadth of assessment methods. This includes the pedagogical rationale for assessment types and their weighting (with reports written to the teaching director required prior to agreement over publication of Module Outlines) • The Teaching Committee to consider how a dissertation module/project can be added to Level 6 provision. • The Teaching Committee to consider the creation of optional modules at Level 5 and 6, further differentiating alternative economics, business and finance pathways. • Finding means to further enhance the School's module guidance systems, such that student choices are consistent with their graduation aims. • Further strengthening module review, with action points- where necessary- focused on potential methods to enhance

| | assessment outcomes. Module convenors will focus on assessments which generate less than 75% of the cohort achieving marks of 60% or more. This will be monitored by the Teaching Director.

2. <u>Formative Assessment</u>
With the opportunities provided by the implementation of Bachelors and Integrated Masters programmes (BIM), the School has been successful in introducing various forms of formative assessment in undergraduate provision. Focus is now on improving on their effectiveness. Recommendations include:
- The provision of more evidence (e.g. take-up and impact) by module convenors to improve on future reviews of assessment.
- Improving awareness of the value of formative assessment for summative assessment outcomes (e.g. Communication of the roles of formative assessment to students using the 'Assessment & Feedback' content area on the module's Blackboard site).

3. <u>Learning Outcomes</u>
Given the relatively recent changes in the discipline's Benchmarking Statement (e.g. reaction to student request for more pluralist perspectives), the School is intensifying its curricula review. The time frame is as follows:
- Module convenors to look at their module's learning outcomes and clarify wording according to the Benchmarking Statement.
- The Teaching Committee to investigate the mapping of learning outcomes across all modules (potentially impacting on future module provision and design). |

| Any University wide issues identified: | - There are continued concerns over the quality of teaching spaces. There are too many failures of equipment and too much variation in the quality of individual rooms. Moreover, any additional investment in technology by Faculty staff to further enhance student engagement is under significant threat.
- The use of study plus/revision week, together with the higher time costs associated with the reassessment period, increases pressures on module convenors. This could be considered for work allocation models. |

| Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process: | The School will continue to monitor all modules on an annual basis as part of its Annual Teaching Review.

Particular attention will be paid to the impact of new modules offered for 2016/17. |

| Issues arising from placement and work-based learning: | Although the School does not have currently offer Placement opportunities, it does offer internships. These opportunities, however, are restricted by space considerations. Without the provision of further 'quality' space, the continued success of the School is under threat. |

Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	• In all years (including those with a Course Review) we have a panel to review all the UG Module Review forms and make recommendations for discussion at a full meeting of the School. This allows sharing of good practice. This School meeting takes place every year and is devoted to an Annual Teaching Review (ATR), which was last held on 19th July, 2016. Minutes of this meeting were circulated so that Action points arising from the ATR can be incorporated into the module outlines for 2016-17. • The School has a learning and teaching seminar series, Ecuator, with an independent on-line presence. Timetabling of events reflect support from external organisations such as the Economics Network. • Learning and Teaching Enhancement is recognised as a separate entity in our annual review. Diffusing of good practice will also be provided by the Faculty's scheme to target specific modules for University learning technology support.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *R. Chakrabarty*
	Date: 04/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	It is reassuring to be able to note a myriad of good parctice processes in ECO. Going forward the school seems to be set to excel in several areas of learning and teaching. The plan to look at learning outcomes across courses, pro-actively looking at aligning modules to the changed QAA subject benchmarks, identifying modules with less success on securing excellent results keeping Good Honours in mind etc. are but only a few of some excellent ideas present in their action plan going forward in ECO. Well done to the Teaching Director of ECO. Concerns voiced again echo the same issues as other schools.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	As above

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate Taught			
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	International Development	Year: 2015/16	
Courses monitored and updated:	All undergraduate programmes: U1L2F7304, U1L2FR304, U1L2L1304, U1L2L6302/3, U1L2LC304, U1L2LP302/3, U1L920V02, U1L921305, U1L922304, U1L9P3301, U1L9PO301, U1LL78302, U1LL7V302		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	In 2016-17 we will continue to expose students to a diverse range of learning and teaching methods. We will also continue to offer a diverse range of assessment strategies. We will include a new piece of formative assessment in the autumn semester for 1st year students, in the Introduction to Development Studies (IDS) module, in response to student feedback via the SSLC. We will also aim to co-ordinate coursework deadlines across modules better, also in response to SSLC feedback. We will also continue to use the new DEV feedback form, and provide information to students on Blackboard and in Module Outlines on the specific marking criteria used for each piece of summative assessment on the module. This is the most likely reason for the very large improvement for DEV for Assessment and Feedback in the NSS 2016 - the average score for rose from 51% to 77%. All questions under this category saw big increases, particularly for clear marking criteria, promptness of feedback, detailed feedback, and the usefulness of feedback. Following discussions at the Annual DEV Review of Moderation and Assessment held in June 2016, staff have agreed a set of 'best-practice' guidelines with the use of the new feedback form, designed to improve the consistency and quality of feedback given (see below). We will continue to monitor marking standards carefully, through the use of moderation across markers within modules, and careful		

	comparison of marks across modules at the Module Boards and Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment. Teaching teams on modules where levels of marks in 2015-16 were significantly higher or lower than the overall average are requested to carefully review their assessment strategy for 2016-17. We will also continue monitor the results from student module evaluations, and seek to respond to feedback where possible, particularly for modules with significantly lower scores than the average.

Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	At the Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment a dedicated discussion was held regarding the use of the new feedback form. The following guidelines were agreed:
	
	1. Using the Form
	  a) Quantity of Feedback: for a 'standard' 2,000 word essay a norm of 400-500 words or between 1 and 2 pages for the completed form.
	    i) Clearly this will vary with the length and type of assignment
	  b) Be cautious with the use of certain expressions like 'good', 'high standard' and 'exemplary' in your comments, especially in the top section of the form. These are all associated in the Senate Scales with particular mark ranges and students may be puzzled if your own use of language does not fit this: for example 'high standard' in the Senate Scales means 70-79%.
	  c) Feed Forward: the tone here should be predominantly positive rather than focussed on what was wrong with *this* piece of work. Where elements such as referencing or writing need improvement students could be referred to the DEV guides on these areas.
	  d) No box should be left entirely blank
	2. Weights and Marks
	  a) The wide range of assessment tasks and variety of learning outcomes to assess means that uniform weights across school would not be appropriate. However, excessive variation with no clear rationale can be undesirable, unfair and annoying to students. So some strategies to limit arbitrary variation in weights are proposed.
	  b) Weighting norms
	    i) 15%- 25% & Minimum 10% for Achievement of Learning Outcomes & Level of Scholarship
	    ii) Maximum 10% for Written Communication
	    iii) Maximum 10% for Presentation
	    iv) Standard 5% for Academic Referencing (see also below*)
	  c) *Academic Referencing only: ALL markers to use a stepped scale as follows
	    i) 100% thorough & correct
	    ii) 80% one or two minor errors
	    iii) 60% several minor errors, or one or two significant errors

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>

iv)   40%   several significant errors

v)   20%   some attempt to reference but below acceptable standard

vi)   0%   no attempt at referencing whatsoever

d) 'stepped scale' means only above marks to be given, eg. no 56, 64, 72 etc.

e) This effectively means that Academic Referencing is marked on a 0 to 5 scale, since each of the steps corresponds to one point in the overall mark.

f) All other criteria to be marked on the usual 0 – 100 scale widely used in UK social science but with readiness to award marks at the higher or lower end of the scale as indicated by the senate scale criteria.

3. Accompanying Guidance

   a) Handbooks and/or Blackboard should include guidance on how senate scale criteria will be applied to each particular piece of summative coursework.

   b) Module learning outcomes should be reflected in how senate scale criteria applied

   c) Good practice also to attach the guidance on application of senate scale criteria with feedback form when returning work

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Any University wide issues identified:</td><td>

Our use of a new feedback form, based on a form used in NBS, has proved very successful. It has been well received by students and is likely to be the main factor behind the large rise in our NSS scores in 2016-17. This is certainly something worth sharing within the Faculty and UEA more broadly.

Our experience in DEV with year-long, 40 credit modules also may have wider relevance for the Faculty and University. We found that these modules were not popular with staff or students. Students felt it restricted their choices and meant a very stressful final exam in the summer, covering the whole year. Staff found it more difficult to co-ordinate the inevitably larger teaching teams and to ensure coherence in teaching methods and content between the two semesters. Overall we feel that single-semester 20 credit modules work much better.

One final point – to help build links with the BA/BSc Geography degrees taught in ENV, and take advantage of potential overlaps and synergies with our own BA Geography and International Development, we would welcome any steps taken by UEA toward greater standardisation of timetabling systems used by different Faculties.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the</td><td>

New modules:
Communication for Development (DEV-5015A)
Economics of Development 2 (DEV-5016A)*
Economics of Development 3 (DEV-5017B)*
Natural Resources and Development 2 (DEV-5012A)**
Natural Resources and Development 3 (DEV-5013B)**

</td></tr>
</table>

monitoring and update process:	Geography Field Course (DEV-5016B) Introduction to the Politics of Development (DEV-4009B) *Replacing the former 40 credit module, Economics of Development (DEV-5012Y). **Replacing the former 40 credit module, Natural Resources and Development (DEV-5013Y). *Modules in their 2nd year:* Humanitarian Communication (DEV-4008B) Methods in Human Geography (DEV-5014A) Urban Geographies (DEV-6010B) Engaging Anthropology and Development (DEV-6008Y) *First review this cycle:* Introduction to Development Studies (DEV-4001A) Gender and Development (DEV-5001A) Sub-Saharan African Development (DEV-5006B) Development Work Experience (DEV-6004A) *Issues arising from student evaluation & new teaching team:* Resource Development and Conservation (DEV-6005B)
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None in particular. The Development Work Experience (DWE) module remains very popular with students and is highly valued. We will however review the module in 2016-17, as it has not been through a formal review yet this cycle.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	DEV staff meetings (fortnightly) – at least 3 of these are dedicated to teaching matters. We plan to run a series of training workshops throughout the year for staff in using Online reading lists – the aim being 100% use of these across all modules by 2017-18 Next DEV Annual Review of Teaching and Moderation – June 2017
Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	*R. Chakraborty* 05/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	It is reassuring to see how good practice is being shared effectively in the faculty. The school of International Development has seen significant improvement in Assessment and Feedback scores in the NSS 2016 - the average score for rose from 51% to 77%. This is no mean achievement after several years of poor scores. A lot of effort is being given to marking and feedback guidelines to staff and organisation of training workshops etc. – all commendable.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-	ADLTQ will summarise the good practice across schools in SSF and will have a document for discussion at the November LTQC and present the same to SSF Exec and LTC as well.

proposed process and timescale.	

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught *(delete as appropriate)* **For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)**			
School:	EDU	Year:	2015-16
Courses monitored and updated:	BA Education BA Physical Education		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	Employability is a theme that is 'threaded' throughout modules on all EDU UG courses. The intention of some courses (i.e. BA Education & BA Physical Education) being graduate employment within the education sector (and also beyond education) or further training (e.g. PGCE). Work-based learning is a key feature of the EDU UG courses (and is linked to employability). Placement opportunities with local and regional agents provide students with valuable work-based knowledge, skills and understanding; ultimately enhancing the students' employability. These opportunities are reported extremely favourably in student evaluations. This partnership between employer and the UEA is made possible by a sound support network. Formative work is used throughout all modules (both 'informal' and 'formal' formative work and feedback) and, in addition to supporting the students with their summative submission, provides a useful opportunity to develop a strong student-staff rapport (especially, during interactive seminars). The BA Education and BA Physical Education programmes both provide additional enhancement activities or courses/awards to further supplement the two degree programmes (the aim being to further enhance employability). Both programmes get very good student evaluations and external examiner reports. Good honours scores are also very good (86% and		

	83% for the BA Education and BA Physical Education courses, respectively).
	As a result of the Annual Review of Assessment and Moderation meeting (held during a Teaching Committee meeting), the following action plan was derived: 1. Review module-level learning outcomes (LOs) across all modules and apply any necessary adjustments so LOs are appropriate and clearly coupled to assessment demands and aligned with programme-level outcomes. 2. Ensure that senate marking scale criteria is explicitly provided to students (either through Portal/Blackboard or in teaching sessions) to enable students to clearly see the criteria that is used to mark assignments. 3. Ensure that each summative assessment (in a module) has at least one formative assessment task (more if possible). 4. Continue to encouraging good practice sharing of ideas, strategies, and techniques, in relation to teaching and learning, through our usual networks (School Board, School Meetings, and Teaching Committee etc.). A review of credit weighing and the associated workload for UG modules will be conducted during the academic year. This will be to ensure standardisation of the two UG courses, in terms of the award conferred on students (i.e. a BA degree) and the 'amount of work' a student has to do (i.e. in terms of word count, number of assessment items etc.).
Any University wide issues identified:	The main issues identified by the various EDU UG courses relate to working with or interaction with the LTS Hub. These issues include, but are not limited to, the following: course directors and course teams receiving mixed messages in relation to procedures and/or rule changes; a lack of communication in some instances; problems with timetabling; problems with room booking; and problems with the SITS 'system'. Although it must be noted that most of these issues have improved from the previous year. Staffing has also been an issue for the UG courses (e.g. replacing staff that have left with permanent appointments rather than through associate tutor contacts – in relation to the student experience).
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	All EDU UG courses have decided to continue to review their modules for the academic year 2016-17; until the new internal quality assurance process is implemented in September 2017. The majority of EDU courses (UG & PGT) have historically monitored all modules annually, as this is seen as best practice within the School, and therefore, all courses will continue to do so until the new procedures are implemented.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed	Examples of good practice from the two courses are usually disseminated through the biannual School Board (and/or Summer staff meeting), Course Director's Teaching Committee meeting, peer observation, and other informal communication methods.

process and timescale:	

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *R. Chakraborty*
	Date: 03/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	Several areas of good practice is evidenced in the day to day operation of the courses: the rigorousness with formative assessment, employability focus etc. Issues identified are in line with other schools – such as timetabling and rooms for teaching. EDU also had problems with LTS but there is expectation that things will improve going forward.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	ADLTQ will make a summary of good practice evidenced in SSF and that will be discussed at SSF LTQC and also SSF Exec.

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	LAW	Year:	2015/16
Courses monitored and updated:	M100 LLB Law M120 LLB Law with European Legal Systems M121 LLB Law with French Law and Language M123 LLB Law with American Law U1M201103 Certificate of Higher Education in Common Law		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	<u>NSS (from information provided by BIU)</u> NSS 2016 results for LAW are extremely positive with above average scores on the vast majority of themes and improvements on almost all questions. LAW scored above the UEA average across all themes and league table averages other than Learning Resources (where it is in line with the UEA average). Overall satisfaction - Despite a slight drop in rank, UEA remains in the top sixth of scores for Law in 2016. UEA's rank has fallen from joint 1st out of 81 institutions in 2015 to joint 3rd (with Cambridge, Teesside and Oxford Brookes) out of 81 institutions in 2016. Teaching - In 2016, UEA ranks 1st out of English mainstream universities for Overall Satisfaction for just one subject area; Law. With a score of 99% for Teaching, UEA has seen another increase in rank for Law, from joint 2nd out of 81 institutions in 2015 to 1st out of 81 institutions in 2016, ahead of Cambridge in 2nd position. Assessment and feedback - UEA increased its ranks to 10th out of 81 institutions (joint with Buckinghamshire New) and with Teesside leading the table. UEA's score for Law is now in the top 25% of scores. UEA is up 4 percentage points for the second year with improvement on several questions but particularly marked for Feedback on my work has helped me clarify things I did not understand (+12 percentage points)		

The School also achieved improvements for Academic Support (up 9 percentage points).

Course review

In 2014, one of the governing professional bodies, the Solicitor's Regulatory Authority, announced that it would be reforming the rules governing Qualifying Law Degrees and conditions for entry into the profession. The exact nature of the reforms and the consequences for law degrees are still to be clarified (and whether the other governing body, the Bar Council, will adopt the same position or not) and the School continues to await the outcome with a view to ensuring any curriculum review meets the needs of prospective applicants.

Employability

The School continues to invest heavily in ensuring that its graduates are as well-equipped as they can be when they come to apply for jobs, whether or not those are in legal practice. This includes

- running a series of lectures and seminars in our 1st year module Law in Practice on career development skills (alongside developing and practising skills such as giving an effective presentation and working in teams) ;

- arranging a programme of careers events covering both legal and non-legal careers, including workshops delivered by regional and national law firms and other employers, plus panel sessions with former students;

- establishing UEA internships with regional and national firms of solicitors and with in-house legal departments and in non-legal roles (note that large, regional law firm, Birketts, for the past few years has recruited all their trainee solicitors solely from those students who had interned with them from the Law School) ;

- developing internships at an international level, for example with the first students at Sime Darby Group, Malaysia, in August 2016

- assisting in the organisation of UEA's only careers fair dedicated to a single profession, the annual Law Careers Fair in November;

- appointing a team of 4 faculty members with overall control of careers and employability issues;

- instituting a mentoring system, whereby 2nd and final year students are able to apply to be "mentored" by (usually) recent UEA Law school graduates for careers advice –

	perhaps offering views on a draft CV or assisting preparation for interview.
	- ensuring that every student is able to have a mock interview before applying for employment or work placement - Students also have the opportunity to participate in mock "Apprentice" style exercise with top regional firm, Mills and Reeve, putting together a tender for legal services and then doing a presentation to convince the 'clients' as to why their team should secure the work.. UEA Law Clinic The UEA Law Clinic was formally launched in November 2012, building on many years of enthusiastic volunteering by UEA law students. Its formation has led to a rapid growth in the pro bono opportunities available to students in the Law School. In 2015/16, over 200 UEA law students took part in pro bono activities of one kind or another, including the award-winning Welfare Benefits Advocacy Service, the Free Legal Advice Scheme, Street Law, the Humanitarian Law Project (a ground-breaking collaboration with the British Red Cross) and the justiceproject@uea. The UEA Law Clinic co-ordinates all these activities, and acts as a catalyst both for the development of new pro bono projects (which at UEA are typically student-led), and the establishment of external pro bono partnerships. The work of students within the Law Clinic has already gained national recognition. We received three Runners-Up awards in the annual LawWorks/Attorney General Student Pro Bono Awards in 2013 and 2014 (the only Law School to be shortlisted for three awards in two years), and we topped this in June 2014, when we were awarded the prize for 'Best Partnership in Pro Bono' in the prestigious national LawWorks Awards, for our partnership with Norfolk Community Law Service (NCLS). One product of this partnership, the Welfare Benefits Advocacy Service, where UEA student-advocates represent clients in the social security appeals tribunals, has recovered in the region of £1.5 million for clients since October 2012. In March 2016, the UEA Law Society were awarded the prize for Best Pro Bono Activities in 2016 LawCareers.Net Student Law Society Awards, beating off stiff competition from UCL and York. The pro bono work of students from the Law School has also been recognised in the UEA Engagement Awards, where our students have received three awards in recent years. We have exciting plans for the next few years as we look ahead to the opening of our new Law Clinic premises in the outbuildings at Earlham Hall in January 2017, and there will be many opportunities for the current generation of students to play a major role in shaping the future of pro bono in the UEA Law School.

	The UEA Law Clinic is run by a Management Committee consisting primarily of students, along with members of the academic staff and representatives of the external agencies that we work with.
	Student Law Society The School has a very active student Law Society which is fully supported by the School. Along with a wide variety of social activities, the society organises the mooting, negotiations and client interviewing competitions, providing students with the opportunity to develop essential employability skills. For example, a significant number of law students take part in the mooting competitions, 96 students in 2014/15 and 134 students 2015/16 (reflecting the increase in student numbers in the School which is anticipated to continue to grow), with both beginners competitions and advanced competitions. The final of the advanced competitions is a key event in the Law School's calendar which, in 2015/16, took place in the Norwich Crown Court. In some previous years, this moot has even been held in the Supreme Court in London. The winners of the internal, advanced competitions will go on to take part in national mooting competitions, such as the OUP & BPP National Mooting Competition. In light of all of the above, the School plans to continue with its good efforts in all areas.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	The meeting was held on 15th September 2016: It was agreed that: - The School was unhappy with the university's procedure which allows students to appeal against an exam result and request a remark, when the marking has been through the quality assurance procedures of first marking, moderation and external examiner (which is particularly the case for any fails). Allowing such appeals undermines the marking procedure. - The School would not provide new exam papers in cases where the university has allowed a student to sit an exam overseas, but the student is not able to arrange for the exam to take place on the scheduled day due to a national holiday (or similar) in the other country. - Any materials provided to students in exams will be integrated into the exam question paper as the Exams Office appears to struggle with providing the materials as separate documents.
Any University wide issues identified:	Self-certification procedure - negatively impacts on the marking and moderation process when too low a number of students have submitted work within the 20 day turn around period. - hinder module organisers from adopting innovative forms of assessment, particularly assessments to be completed in short periods of time. - impact detrimentally on the courses' goals of preparing students for a professional environment in which failure to meet deadlines is a

competency issue and of profound consequence to clients. In addition, the lack of scrutiny of self-certification to ensure at least wording in compliance with grounds specified in the regulations does not contribute to developing students' professionalism, with a negative impact on their employability.

Remaking requests for summative assessment
- The procedure fails to take into account that the first marker and moderator are the subject specialists and that the School may not have a third member of faculty who is able to competently comment on the assessment
- external examiners do not appear to be not notified that results which they have agreed are being altered following a remark, even when the student paper in question may have been included in the sample sent to the external examiner (a third specialist in the area – in which case, why allow the student to ask for a 4th person to mark the paper when the mark has been agreed by three separate, competent people?)
- There is no scrutiny of the grounds for requesting a remark of summative coursework which may be based on weak grounds, when the onus should be on the student to demonstrate why they should be able to call into question a decision reached in accordance with the formal marking and moderation process,

20 day turn around period for marking summative coursework
- impacts on the format of summative coursework set rather than it being based purely on pedagogic grounds
- Impacts on the ability of faculty to provide the individual level of feedback/feedforward desired by both staff and students.
- fails to take into account the number of faculty able to mark on a particular module in relation to the number of students, given the high level of specialism required to undertake the marking

Lack of teaching space and the poor quality of some teaching rooms
- This significantly affects the student learning experience, something which the School is held accountable for through eg the NSS, but over which we have no control
- The School is very concerned about the coming year and the continued use of eg Blackdale and the use in the coming year of the Sportspark (will the students have sufficient desk space, will the temporary set-up for the IT always work properly, will students be able to access the building without a campus card as they do other teaching rooms etc)
- The School will not consider itself as accountable for these issues in 2016/17 nor for its impact on the NSS results

Examinations
- there is insufficient time given to markers of examinations scheduled at the end of the examination period. It assumes that markers will mark over the weekend in order to meet the deadline
- the details of the reassessment exam timetable is published very late in the academic year, giving module organisers very short notice as to when their exams will take place (particularly compared to how early module organisers must submit their reassessment

	exam papers to the Exams Office – the same amount of time is not given in return to module organisers as to when the exams will take place) Administrative support - There is insufficient administrative support for teaching and teaching-related activities. Colleagues in both the Arts HUB and Study Abroad Office are overstretched and have to function in very cramped working conditions.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	All modules are reviewed annually as a matter of long-standing School policy. All reports from Module Organisers are sent to the Director of Teaching and Learning.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	There were no issues arising from study abroad placements in the relevant degree programmes. No degrees involve work-based learning.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	The School's UG Teaching Committee meets three times per year, and includes a range of faculty members. The School Board meets twice per year and the School's Executive Committee at least once a month, with teaching and teaching-related issues are discussed at each with a view to disseminating good practice via reports from the Director of Learning and Teaching, Senior Advisor an Director of Employability. The Law School Teaching Day took place on 9 May 2016 and the School's annual Assessment and Moderation meeting on 15 September 2016. The School also adheres to the university policy on peer observation. In addition, there are regular, ad hoc, email communications from DLT, and the faculty is relatively small and collegiate which allows for many informal discussions, dissemination of good practice and sharing of ideas.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *R. Chakraborty*
	Date: 04/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	There is a myriad number of examples of good practice existing within the school of LAW. Notwithstanding that, LAW school is engaged in continuous improvement in its learning and teaching activities: course monitoring, assessment and feedback, employability of its students etc. LAW raises several concerns that go beyond the usual teaching room issues. Some of these are: The university policy of allowing for re-marking of exam scripts; the self-certification policy; 20 day

	turnaround policy; tight time for marking examination scripts; late publication of re-sit dates; administrative support etc. A very well done to the Teaching Director and her colleagues in achieving fantastic results at the last NSS and doing so inspite of several difficulties faced with teaching rooms, poor quality an dfailing IT, timetabling difficulties etc. Well done and thank you.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale.	ADLTQ will endeavour to summarise the good practice evidenced in LAW and share the information at SSF LTQC in November and the SSF Exec and also at university LTC.

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate / Postgraduate Taught
<i>(delete as appropriate)</i>
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)</td></tr>
<tr><td>School:</td><td>NBS</td><td>Year:</td><td>2015/6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Courses monitored and updated:</td><td colspan="3">

Course	Route Code
BSc Accounting And Finance	U1N400302
BSc Accounting And Management	U1NN42302
BSc Business Management	U1N200303
BSc Management (Pre 2015)	U1N200302
Visiting Studies in Business Management	U1N299V01
BSc Finance And Management (Pre 2015)	U1NN32302
BSc Business Finance and Management	U1NN32303
BSc Marketing And Management	U1NN52302

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of good practice and action plans:</td><td colspan="3">Good Practice

- The introduction of year tutors to support the needs of students at each level of the course is working well and has enabled induction and other transitions. There was a formal re-induction of second and third year students for the first time.

- The school has provided extra support for borderline cases – those students with average marks between 55 and 59.99 - who have the potential with extra work and support from the school to gain good honours. This has contributed to another increase in the proportion of students obtaining a good honours degrees, up from 79% in 2014-15 to an estimated 90% in 2015-16.</td></tr>
</table>

- Employability strategy including: a) Employability week has been expanded in 2015/16. A range of events and activities, covering job seeking but also help with internship, the use of social media and the development of employability related skills were provided and a large number of students were involved. b) Employability prizes, with employers providing prizes for the best pieces of coursework on a module, were introduced. c) The Graduate Trainee Management Scheme (GTMS) – our post-graduation placement scheme, operated for the third year providing a personal development experience for approximately 30 year 3 students and resulting in students being offered and accepting places with participating employers. d) Across the programme, contact with employers has been promoted through the use of guest lecturers from business and the professions.

- On our Business Finance and Management course, the planned introduction in 2016/17 of a 'Financial Skills' training programme directed to year 3 students. This will allow students to consolidate the finance knowledge gained from all four finance modules of the programme both theoretically and practically. Upon completion, students will receive the Thomson Reuters Eikon® professional certificate.

- On our Business Finance and Management course, membership of the 'CFA University Recognition Program' giving our UG students the opportunity to attain the most highly regarded professional qualification in finance.

Action Plan

In order to prepare for the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) at the subject level a ten point TEF Readiness Plan is being implemented in 2016-17.

(1)   New form of Peer Observation of Teaching (POT).

POT has UEA "Code of Practice" status. This means that it is mandatory, with everyone required to be observed at least once every two years. In the past, colleagues have selected partners. In order to improve the **spread of best practice**, this will now change to a within- subject-area-group exercise. Within each subject area group, either the GH or a nominated group member will conduct **all** observations within the group. This "Group Observer" (GO) should be an experienced teacher and should in turn be observed by another nominated group member. In addition to the requirements of UEA's CoP policy, after all observations have been completed, each GO should convene an **additional group level meeting** where areas of improvement and related support and modifications are discussed and agreed. Probationary colleagues are also asked to take part in this group level exercise in addition to the teaching observation requirement that is part of their probationary process. Any group member that is uncomfortable with being observed by the GO, can select another group member as observer.

(2)   Teaching Activity Planning (TAP) Meetings.

Similar to the RAP (Research Activity Planning) meetings that are already established as part of REF Readiness, TAP meetings will be established as part of TEF Readiness. As with RAP meetings, these meetings are not formal "performance management" in the strict HR sense. They are not disciplinary and should not be perceived as threatening. Their purpose is to help, support and **coach** colleagues to deliver high quality teaching and assessment that will enhance **their career prospects** as well as meet **student** and **UEA** expectations: **Win, Win, Win**.

These meetings will be organised by the HoS's PA. Beginning with UG, MOs of modules scoring below 3.75 out of 5 for overall satisfaction in the most recent student evaluation data will be asked to attend an **informal meeting** with HoS and DoLTQ to discuss the module's evaluation data, the examination performance of students on the module (overall and by assessment piece), and the module outline document. The 3.75 trigger will be initially used in 2016-17 to take into account the generally low evaluation questionnaire response rates of the most recent student evaluation. Response rates are expected to improve in 2016-17 (see 3 below) and so in 2017-18 the TAP trigger will rise to 4. Why 4? Because 4 out of 5 is the minimum used in student surveys such as the NSS to indicate that students are satisfied.

The MO may bring a colleague to the meeting. Ideally, this would be the MO's GH but can be any member of UEA faculty. The tone of these meetings will be **positive and supportive**, seeking to understand the extent to which evaluation data are due to external and/or temporary factors. **They will aim to help the MO plan the next run of the module**.

(3) Improved Module Evaluation Questionnaire Response Rates.

Component (2) above relies on valid module evaluation data. Validity improves with response rate and so it is important that the current low module evaluation questionnaire response rates are improved. For this reason, it is now School policy with immediate effect that **all MOs reserve teaching time for students to complete the module evaluation questionnaire**. Completion times will vary. For example, the questionnaire for a team-taught module will take longer to complete than a module taught by a single person. Please estimate the time for your module and provide at least that for questionnaire completion. Completion should be **as close to the end of the module as possible**. Please provide **ample notice of this task** and ask students to bring their smartphone, tablet or computer. Please also provide a **strong incentive to attend the session that will be used for this purpose**, for example by setting the task at the end of a revision or

assessment briefing session. Module evaluation questionnaire response rates will be monitored and a **minimum response rate of 50% should now be possible**.

In addition to the formal module evaluation questionnaire, MOs should seek student feedback more informally about half way through the module via the use of a **suggestion box**. The module's suggestion box (please improvise here; for example, an old biscuit tin and a note pad will do the trick) should be placed at the entrance of the teaching room and students encouraged and given a small amount of teaching time to write anonymous feedback and place it in the box. **Student expectations should be managed**. Clearly you will not be able to implement some suggestions (e.g., eliminating summative assessment!) but you should be able to implement some suggestions (e.g., talking more slowly; slides that are less busy etc.). **After reading the suggestions, the MO should let the students know either in a session or via Blackboard what changes will be made as a result of the feedback**.

(4) Course Activity Planning (CAP) Meetings.

There is considerable variation in the NSS performance of our 5 UG degrees. BSc Accounting & Finance, BSc Accounting & Management and BSc Business Finance & Management all scored considerably better than BSc Management and BSc Marketing & Management. Clearly, in addition to the module level, the course level is important. Accordingly, similar to the TAP meetings outlined in (3) above, informal CAP meetings with HoS and DoLTQ will be established as part of NBS TEF Readiness. These meetings will be organised by the HoS's PA. Beginning with UG, CLs of courses scoring less than the NBS average for overall satisfaction in the most recent NSS (PTES for PG when course level data are available) will be asked to attend a CAP meeting to discuss the course's evaluation data and the examination performance of students on the course. The CL may bring a colleague to the meeting. Ideally, this would be the CL's GH but can be any member of UEA faculty. As with TAP meetings, the tone of these meetings will be **positive and supportive**, seeking to understand the extent to which course performance is due to exogenous and/or temporary factors. **They will aim to help the CL plan the next run of the course**.

(5) Academic Advising.

Data on academic support and advising vary considerably with some students very satisfied with the support, guidance and encouragement that they receive and others disappointed. In response to this feedback, the monitoring of advising will be improved. A short mid-year Advising Evaluation Questionnaire will be sent to all advisees. Our Senior Adviser will then meet with Advisers that score less than the School average for overall satisfaction to discuss an improvement plan and decide if extra support or training is required. To **acknowledge and celebrate excellent advising**, based on overall satisfaction, each year our

most highly rated adviser will receive an **NBS Academic Support Excellence Award**.

(6) Faculty Recruitment.

It is important that we recruit new staff that can teach or have the potential to teach at the level expected. Current attendance at recruitment presentations tends to include HoS, DoLTQ, appointment panel members and subject group members only. With immediate effect, it is now expected that, when possible, PDs, CLs and the WAM Coordinator also attend all recruitment presentations to ensure that good teaching appointments are made.   Attendance will also enable a wider group of colleagues to gain a heads-up on new teaching resource enabling early planning of teaching allocation.

(7) New Monitoring Spreadsheet for all Programmes.

As stated earlier, a theme of this TEF Readiness Plan is more formal monitoring of teaching quality. For this purpose each of our three PDs will be required to create and maintain a spreadsheet with TAP and CAP triggers for their programme. We will adapt an excellent model currently used by CMP. The following variables will be monitored beginning with UG and 2015-16 data:
Module Code
Module Name
Module Organiser
Module Evaluation Overall Satisfaction **(TAP trigger)**
Module Evaluation Response Rate
Number of Students on Module
Average Module Mark
Module Mark SD
No. of Module Students Achieving Good Honours
% of Module Students Achieving Good Honours
Number of Module Students Failing (with delayed assessment or re-assessment)
% of Module Students Failing (with delayed assessment or re-assessment)
Nature of Module Assessment - whether CW or Exam or both
Size of Module Teaching Team
Composition of Module Teaching Team (number of ATR, ATS, AT and/or Teaching Fellows)
Course Evaluation Overall Satisfaction **(CAP trigger)**

(8) Semesterisation

There is much evidence that learning and teaching are more effective, and so student satisfaction higher, when a module is delivered over one semester rather than two or more. Accordingly, where possible and desirable, modules will be taught in one semester. The move towards semesterising some of our UG modules is already underway and will be accelerated this year.

	(9) Service Teaching Some NBS modules have a large proportion of students from other schools. This can make it difficult to know where to pitch the material and can affect the satisfaction of both NBS and non-NBS students. Accordingly, where possible and desirable, modules with a large cohort of non- NBS students will be split and delivered separately for NBS and non-NBS students. The move towards splitting modules with high levels of service teaching is already underway and will be accelerated this year. **(10) Rewarding Teaching Excellence** Excellent teaching does of course have many existing rewards. The University has introduced teaching excellence awards, excellent teaching is rewarded in the promotions and confirmation of appointment process, and very little in this line of work beats the sense of satisfaction felt when a module has gone well. **In addition to these existing rewards**, NBS is relaunching internal awards for teaching excellence. The details have yet to be ironed out but I can announce that there will be one award each for UG and PG teaching, and two further special awards, one each for the UG and PG, for large module teaching. The awards will be in the form of a £1,000 top-up to the recipient's Staff Development Budget (to be shared if the module is team-taught).
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	- Where possible and desirable, modules will be taught in one semester. The move towards semesterising some of our UG modules is already underway and will be accelerated this year. - Where possible and desirable, modules with a large cohort of non-NBS students will be split and delivered separately for NBS and non-NBS students. The move towards splitting modules with high levels of service teaching is already underway and will be accelerated this year. - All MOs to reserve teaching time for students to complete the module evaluation questionnaire. Completion should be as close to the end of the module as possible. Ample notice of this task and a strong incentive to attend the session should be provided. - It was reported that there is not a good take up of formative assessment by students. It was agreed that an analysis of the effect of completion of formative assessment on summative assessment grades was required and that this should be completed by Module Organisers.
Any University wide issues identified:	University to encourage other schools to develop TEF Readiness Plans.
Modules requiring review in	All NBS modules are reviewed every time they run.

subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	None.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	Via TAP and CAP meetings and via our Staff Development Workshop and CPD Programme led by our Director of Staff Development.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: *R. Chakraborty*
	Date: 4/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	If NBS is able to follow through with the myriad of excellent ideas identified above and if all colleagues believe and deliver on their individual responsibility for the success of the TEF Readiness Plan, it will be a very different place NBS will find itself in the next few years. It will be a difficult journey but certainly an inspiring and output driven one. Well done to the Teaching Director of NBS.

Concerns voiced by the school echo the concerns raised by other schools in SSF which includes rooms not fit for purpose for teaching in certain modules, technology failure in rooms and timetabling issues. |
| Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University- proposed process and timescale. | ADLTQ will ensure to do a summary of QAR3s and discuss at the November LTQC and also present to the SSF Exec and LTC. |

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:
- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate Taught			
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)			
School:	Psychology	Year: 2015/16	
Courses monitored and updated:	All undergraduate programmes: • BSc Psychology • BSc Social Psychology • BSc Cognitive Psychology • All with YA routes.		
Summary of good practice and action plans:	Good Practice Summary Creation of a 'quality feedback' culture within the School. The School has focused attention on the standardisation of the quality of feedback. While this has oriented around a common feedback form, this form has provided a focus for team discussion, marking workshops and the embedding of common marking meetings across the teaching team. There has also been close work with ATs regarding the marking process and quality expectations. Taken together the teaching team have a shared vision of marking and feedback requirements. Action Plan Summary 6. Review of Level 5 seminar structure, assessment design and content to enhance student engagement and performance. 7. Expansion of common marking philosophy into Research Design and Analysis spine of the programmes through a focus on common documentation and forms. 8. Level 5 and 6 induction period to incorporate a 'planning and performance session' to highlight how students can maximise their performance and make the most of learning and extracurricular opportunities. 9. Development of Level 6 option portfolio.		

Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	• Associate Tutors and *marking teams.*
	Induction to teaching / marking and moderation management session. Associate tutors and staff new to the department will be invited to a specific series of introduction sessions
	ACTION NC VS KH COMPLETED
	• Marking and moderation responsibilities into diaries.To facilitate planning the marking and moderation schedules will be distributed in Aug 2016.
	ACTION NC COMPLETED
	• Identifying modules to meet a 16 day turnaround
	All masters modules, and the following UG modules should meet 16 day turnaround timescales - Cognitive development; Psychology of risk; Brain and cognition; Social and affective neuroscience.
	ACTION RELEVANT 3rd YEAR MODULE COORDINATORS.
	• Assignments crossing a range of knowledge suitable for team marking
	Assessments for year 1 have been designed to be marked by teaching teams. The year 2 social and developmental assignments will be reviewed to ensure their suitability for team marking.
	ACTION VS AND GN COMPLETED
	• Unbunching assignments
	First year and third year assignments appear reasonably well balanced across the year. The key module for change could be RDA II which incorporates a series of research reports and an exam, perceived pressure from this module spills into others.
	RDA II team to meet to redevelop and redesign module assignment spacing.
	ACTION NC, IS, PE, DG COMPLETED
	• Year 3 examinations
	As we design a new range of Level 6 modules in the autumn of 2016, the assement design will incorporate modules in Sem 2 which are examined. This will maintain student choice but potentially funnel some students into examinations. ACTION NC, VS
	• Facilitate feedback to students prior to the NSS
	Increased number of modules in year 3 means that student numbers will be small on a range of Semester 1 modules to ensure that all
	ACTION 3rd YEAR SEM 1 MODULE COORDINATORS.

Any University wide issues identified:	**Teaching room crisis** The major issue to be addressed at University level is the room situation which has become progressively worse over recent years during a time of significant growth in Psychology and other SSF Schools. The lack of suitable teaching accommodation creates stress within the administrative process and negatively impacts upon both teaching quality and the student experience. **Defined choice of out of School modules** The process of defined choice is not easy to operate and does not maximise the potential for students to explore modules outside of their core programme. The institution would benefit from a review of this process so that more students could benefit from interdisciplinary experience. **Maintaining a relationship with students post-graduation.** The current process of graduates being required to use the alumni office to maintain a UEA e-mail contact is inefficient and has a low take up. Students graduate and UEA immediately removes their IT access. This sends an instant message that their relationship with the University is terminated. Maintaining contact with students starts to occur on an ad hoc basis and there is no way to maintain contact with whole cohorts – despite many potential employment opportunities needing to be publicised to graduates. The University should review the process of how we maintain contact and nurture relationships with graduates. We are considering School solutions to this issue, but it would be more efficient for the University to manage this as a whole.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	The School will continue to monitor all modules.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	Internship opportunities are continuing to be developed and a more systematic consideration of this aspect of the UG business will be embedded into future reviews.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	The whole teaching team have been involved with ongoing discussions regarding key elements of the review process, especially in respect fo marking, moderation and feedback. In addition to the annual review day, we have held a week 0 teaching day for all staff (20th Sept 2016) and an extended afternoon teaching meeting for ATs (28th Sept 2016) to ensure practice and processes are shared.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been	Name: *R Chakraborty*

satisfactorily undertaken:	Date: 04/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	There is evidence of very good practice and plans going forward. A few and by no means exhaustive listed below: - Marking and moderation exercise timetabled into diaries - Identifying modules that can reach a 16 day turnaround - Level 5 and 6 focused induction to act as 'planning and performance session' - Facilitating feedback to students prior to NSS University wide issues are those which have been reported year on year via this forum and others. And it is primarily to do with the teaching room crisis in the university forcing staff to teach students in rooms not fit for purpose.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	The above clearly is worth discussing and disseminating via the FLTQC and SSF Exec reporting

Learning and Teaching Service – LTSQAR3

ANNUAL COURSE MONITORING: SCHOOL SUMMARY

Purpose:

- **To evaluate the course to inform quality assurance and enhancement**
- **To update the course**
- **To trigger module(s) review (where necessary)**
- **To identify and share good practice**

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="4">

Stage 1 - School summary – Undergraduate Taught
(delete as appropriate)
For completion by the Teaching Director (LTQ)

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Year:</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses monitored and updated:</td>
<td colspan="3">BA in Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of good practice and action plans:</td>
<td colspan="3">

The following are indicators of the merits of the BA in Social Work course:

Adherence to standards of accrediting professional bodies
The BA in Social Work provides both an academic and a professional qualification. The programme (like the MA programme) has the endorsement of the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and the College of Social Work (TCSW), now closed. The British Association of Social Work has adopted some of the roles of TCSW and the school is guided by the high standards of both HCPC and BASW.

Good practice mandates that course materials and teaching reflect the requirements embedded in BASW's Professional Capabilities Framework and HCPC's Standards of Proficiency in Social Work. These infuse course materials, teaching and practice learning. Academic study and learning occurring in field placement complement one another.

Courses are taught by internationally acknowledged researchers as well as faculty with extensive practice experience
Students are taught by researchers who are experts in several fields (especially adoption, child protection, child development). Evaluation of research faculty's work resulted in the School being rated the 4th best School of Social Work in the country in the most recent REF. Among all Schools and Departments at UEA, SWK was given the highest GPA in the REF. Because ATR staff are as committed to teaching as research, students are exposed to the most recent research findings in major areas of social work to inform their practice.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

In addition, ATS staff have wide ranging areas of expertise (e.g., older population, ethics, disability) that enrich the curriculum.

Variety of teaching methods and inclusion of service users and carers
There is a requirement that students *all* teaching sessions at university and days in their practice placement. Delivery of academic teaching occurs in lectures, seminars, practice skills and communication workshops and role play exercises. Students' feedback shows that this variety of teaching methods as well the inclusion of social work practitioners, and carers and service users in teaching sessions and participating in some of the assessments (role paly & presentations) continues to work well in promoting true integration of theory and practice. There are a number of co-timetabled teaching sessions between the MA and BA years 2 and 3, and students appreciate the exposure to other cohorts.

Small School with available staff
Student to faculty ratio is low and this encourages fruitful collaboration and intellectual exchange. In addition, the small cohort size means that for most course work there is a single marker and a moderator who sees a sample of the work.

Additional help with writing
An Associate Tutor offered individual writing tutorials to complement the assistance provided by the Learning Enhancement Team. This proved popular with students (both academically gifted ones who wished to strengthen their writing as well as those who were struggling with written assignments).

Preparation for field placement
Social work practice learning is an integral part of the programme. Students have preparation sessions before embarking on 70-day placement (year 2) and 100-day placement year 3) to prepare them for field work. These sessions examine specific issues following the year-long preparation for practice module held in year 1. These teaching sessions are provided separately to BA and MA students so that both groups can obtain the guidance associated to their academic level.

Fully qualified practice educators are used for placements.
Only fully qualified practice educators are used as part of students' education. Practice Educators are supported through regular workshops at the University allowing them to share general concerns about their role and to be updated on course requirements. Academic advisers oversee the students' progress in placement.

Strong links with Social Work employers
Employers (Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils and from voluntary agencies) and service users and carers participate in the School's Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment and contribute to course design and modification.

	Being responsive to student feedback 1. In response to feedback from the BA year 2 cohort in 2013-4 that they found the transition from year 1 to year 2 a little challenging, in that year 2 was more intense, with more teaching hours on campus, the School introduced more teaching in year one to address social work skills and research awareness, to ease transition to year 2. Student evaluations (2014-5) of the additional teaching in year 1 shows that this this change continues to be beneficial. 2. Students requested further content on communication skills and minor changes to the course structure were made: In BA Yr 1 Communication Skills is now a unit in SWK-4004Y & is taught & assessed as part of Preparation for Practice. **Achievement** Students graduating gained the following awards: Out of a total of 16 students: 7 gained 1sts (one a 1st*), 5 gained 2.1s and 2 gained 2.2s. One gained a 3rd & one was awarded a Diploma pending a resubmission. In 2015 –16, our BA 'Good Honours' was 75% with 12 out of 16 students achieving 2:1 or above. **Employability** The School is one of only 2 Schools (the other being Medicine) at UEA with 100% employability rate. The School has an Employability Officer who works very closely with the UEA's Careers Central. **Very positive EE reports** The external examiners for the BA have given very positive feedback on the programme. **National Student Survey Results** The most recent results show that the School scored above the UEA average across several domains (academic support 100%; assessment and feedback 93%; organisation and management increased to 80%; in addition, learning resources and personal and professional development scored highly.) The BIU points out in their report that the School has been rated very highly and that, in comparison to the UEA average, the School has performed especially well.
Summary of Recommendations/ Decisions from Annual Review of Moderation and Assessment	The changes made according to the New Academic Model are well integrated into the course. The learning outcomes linked to the HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SoPs), and Social Work's Professional Capabilities Framework are well incorporated into the course. Feedback from students shows a deep appreciation of the teaching team and the methods employed. We intend to look into ways of extending this in the current academic year.
Any University wide issues identified:	Issues arising at the 2 SSLC meetings: • Students were concerned about changes in the times of the park and ride buses as students risked being late for lectures.

	The Senior Advisor (Yvonne Johnson at the time) liaised with the Union of Students. • Inadequate room sizes was raised as an issue by students. The University-wide Working Group looking into teaching rooms said that they would attempt rectify this. The School hopes to some limited priority bookings once again next year.
Modules requiring review in subsequent academic year following the monitoring and update process:	It is School policy to review all modules once a year.
Issues arising from placement and work-based learning:	No issues arising from social work practice placements.
Dissemination of good practice within the School - proposed process and timescale:	Dissemination of good practice is seen at the staff's fortnightly QP meetings. Good practice is also regularly shared at seminars run by the School's Centre for Research on Children and Families. The concerns noted are in line with concerns raised by all schools of SSF.

Stage 2 - For completion by the Faculty Associate Dean (LTQ)

Confirmation that process has been satisfactorily undertaken:	Name: Ratula Chakraborty
	Date: 06/10/2016
Good practice identified and University wide issues *(If different from the above):*	There is evidence of noteworthy good practice which is relayed above.
Dissemination of good practice within the Faculty and University-proposed process and timescale.	ADLTQ will do a summary of good parctice prevalent across the faculty and the same will be discussed at SSF Exec, SSF LTQC and university LTC.