

ANNUAL REPORT ON EVALUATION AND SUBJECT REVALIDATION ACTIVITY: 2018/19

COVER SHEET

Presenter: Mr G Kendall

The annual report on evaluation and subject revalidation activity 2018/19 is presented in 9 sections:

Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Evaluation and Revalidation Activity 2018/19
- 3 Requests for Extension to Period of Approval
- 4 Process
- 5 Panel Reports
- 6 Student Views
- 7 Key Areas Discussed with Course/Subject Teams
- 8 Curriculum Management System
- 9 2018/19 Evaluation/Revalidation Schedule

Recommendation

The following recommendations are for consideration by the Committee:

Panel reports and student views (sections 5 and 6, pages 10-11)

- That faculties and CHERP note the relevant topics raised by panels and students at sections 5 and 6 in preparation for 2019/20 events and other curriculum development.

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE 22 October 2019

ANNUAL REPORT ON EVALUATION AND SUBJECT REVALIDATION ACTIVITY: 2018/19

1 INTRODUCTION

The University's evaluation and revalidation processes provide the means for the University to assure the standards of its provision through reference to both external and internal benchmarks including the University's regulatory framework.

This paper summarises activity during the 2018/19 academic year and reviews matters relating to evaluation and revalidation.

The five-year revalidation schedule is shown in the Annex.

2 EVALUATION AND REVALIDATION ACTIVITY 2018/19

In the 2018/19 academic year, a total of 49 (41 in 2017/18) evaluation and revalidation events were held resulting in the approval/re-approval of 120 (118) courses. Thirty-seven (13) new courses were evaluated through 17 (8) evaluation events and one course (5) was evaluated as part of a revalidation event. In total, 83 (105) courses were reapproved through the 32 (34) revalidation events, of which 19 (5) were in external units. The vast majority of programmes presented for evaluation or revalidation were (re)approved for a five-year period, although a small number (7) were approved for a shorter period to fit in with the schedule for the revalidation unit in which the Faculty had located the proposed courses.

A breakdown of the number of internal and external events is given below:

Events (Courses)	Revalidation	Evaluation	TOTAL
Internal	13 (28)	10 (5)	23 (33)
External	19 (5) (incl. 1 eval)	7 (3)	26 (8)
TOTAL	32 (33) (incl. 1 (5) eval)	17 (8)	49 (41)

Faculties and partner institutions took the opportunity of revalidation to revise substantially provision and to withdraw courses. There was only one joint University and professional, statutory and regulatory body event (7 in 2017/18).

3 REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION TO PERIOD OF APPROVAL

During planning for the 2018/19 revalidation/evaluation activities the Academic Office initiated discussions with faculties about the five-year revalidation schedule to achieve greater parity of distribution in terms of annual number of revalidations/workloads.

a) Extensions Approved during 2018/19

In 2018/19, the following programmes were given an extension to their period of approval and the revalidations have been rescheduled accordingly:

Extension Approved to include 2019 intake

AdvCert/PgCert in Non-Medical Prescribing (unit 22D)

Advanced Diploma in Policing (unit 26K)

PgCert/PgDip/MSc Nursing, PgCert/PgDip/MSc Health Promotion and Public Health (unit 22C)

Extensions approved to include 2020 intake

Access Diploma in Social Sciences & Humanities (South West College) (unit 30Ai)

Access Diploma in Adult Learning with Pathways (Southern Regional College) (unit 30B2)

FdEng Civil Engineering (North West Regional College) (unit 4F)

FdSc Horticulture (CAFRE) (unit 12D)

BSc Hons Biology; MSci (Hons) Biological Sciences (unit 3A)

BSc Hons Business Technology (unit 1bii)

BSc Hons Interactive Media (unit 19ai)

PgCHEP (unit 31C)

PgCert Independent Prescribing, MSc Advanced Clinical Optometry (unit 28Db)

MSc Business Development and Innovation (unit 5B1ai)

MA Journalism, MA International Journalism: Hostile Environment Reporting (unit 19b)

(No revalidations were brought forward to the 2018/19 academic year.)

4 PROCESS

a) Late Events

It is expected that all events should take place no later than 31 May for a course starting in September of the same year, unless there are exceptional circumstances. In 2018/19, three events took place in June and one in September.

A significant number of events were postponed to later in the academic year by Faculties resulting in more (29) than usual in semester 2. This led to some delays in checking revised documents by the Academic Office as priority had to be given to servicing Panel meetings and, in turn, had implications for final sign-off for some documents. However, the reduction to the period provided for course teams to submit their response and revised documentation did seem to help achieve more efficiency overall in the completion of the approval process (see section I).

The Academic Office continues to respond quickly to arrange events for proposals submitted to APAG later in the academic year provided that external Panel members are identified promptly by the Faculty.

b) Approval of new Course Proposals (CA1, CA2 forms) without Evaluation Event

The University normally requires new course proposals to be considered through a formal evaluation process, which involves the submission of a course document for discussion with an evaluation panel. A Faculty may recommend that a new proposal, which derives substantially from currently approved provision, be introduced without full evaluation. In such cases, the Faculty provides a supporting statement, an external assessment together with the programme specification, any new or revised module descriptions, course regulations, and information on resource needs and CVs for any staff not already approved. The CA1 supplement provides a checklist and guidance notes for externals in their consideration of such proposals. This should give, in the context of the existing approval of related provision, the same assurance of standards and quality that the University achieves through the validation process.

APAG may then recommend that such proposals proceed without formal evaluation. This has often been subject to a requirement for external examiner endorsement, and/or the submission of satisfactory programme specification, regulations and module descriptions to the Academic Office for confirmation that the course meets the University's regulatory and standards requirements.

In 2018/19, five courses (MSc Mechanical Engineering, MSc Professional Services Operational Delivery, LLM Employment Law and Practice, PgDip in International Marketing and PGCE International Schools China) were approved without evaluation.

c) Revalidation Preparation

The Academic Office aims to achieve an even distribution of revalidation events between October and March and asks Associate Deans (Education) (normally in October/November) to consider a draft revalidation schedule for the following academic year. When agreed, the Academic Office sends the revalidation preparation forms (CA6) to Associate Deans (Education) for completion and asks Faculties to confirm inter alia the provision in the subject unit and courses to be withdrawn, to identify a Revalidation Unit Co-ordinator and to nominate external panel members. The form highlights the requirement that a CA1/2 form for any new courses or subject strands should be submitted within the normal timeframe for new proposals for consideration by APAG, in advance of the revalidation event.

Whilst it is still the norm that new course proposals should be evaluated separately, Faculties may however submit a case to APAG justifying the evaluation of a new proposal as part of a subject unit revalidation, for example if there is substantial commonality with provision in the unit. In 2018/19, only one proposal was evaluated with other provision undergoing validation.

d) Foundation Degrees

The DEL (now DfE) Framework for the Validation of Foundation degrees (February 2011) sets out the various stages in the planning and approval process and the associated timeframe. The Framework is not intended to replace existing processes in the validating institutions but provides an indicative timeframe, with the programme planning team being expected to agree at an early stage a schedule for their particular course development and validation. Ideally, with all partners giving full co-operation and commitment the curriculum design and validation process might be completed in 20 weeks.

Faculty Partnership Managers continue to endeavour to work within the Framework as far as possible and are asked to complete and submit CA2 forms and associated Faculty assessments in a timely fashion with due regard to the scheduled meetings of APAG. In 2018/19, two Foundation degree proposals were successfully validated for a September 2019 start.

e) Panel Membership

Chairs

Prior to Faculty restructuring panels were normally chaired by Pro-Vice-Chancellors or owing to their non-availability Deans/Associate Deans, but with Heads/Associate Heads of School permitted to chair events. There is now a greater reliance on Heads of School to chair panels, and Associate Heads of School were involved more than previously owing to non-availability of others. The Academic Office intends to develop a set of basic guidance notes in support of panel chairs.

The distribution of chairs for the 49 events in 2018/19 (2017/18 in brackets) is given below:

Pro-Vice-Chancellor Education – 1 (3)
Pro-Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement - 1 (3)
Executive Deans – 0 (0)
Associate Dean Education/Global Engagement – 18 (20)
Heads of School – 20 (10)
Associate Heads of School – 6 (0)
Director of CHERP – 1 (1)
Director of ADDL 2 (3)

Externals

Faculties are asked to nominate a minimum of three external panel members and to identify their area of subject expertise. The CA1, CA2 and CA6 forms make explicit that externals should not be closely associated with the Faculty, e.g. through having recently acted in an advisory capacity, as an external examiner, or been a member of staff. Also, members of the Course/Subject Team should not be closely associated with the nominated external's institution e.g. as an external examiner at the other institution. Nominations should include

an academic expert from GB to ensure that external members are familiar with the UK HE academic infrastructure and it is desirable that they hold at least fellowship of the HEA.

The use of currently active academic staff (with experience of pedagogy and curriculum design) as external panel members is encouraged and nominations from a range of HEIs for provision in related subject areas are considered preferable to repeated reliance on a small number of institutions. This helps to bring different perspectives. From the nominations, the Academic Office normally selects two, but more if necessary to ensure that, the provision within a particular course/subject is fully covered.

In checking the nominations against the external examiner database, the Academic Office continues to identify a small number of proposed externals who are currently or have been recently external examiners for Ulster programmes or who have close links with the School. Alternative nominations are sought from the Faculties. Often Faculties submit a CA1 or CA6 form without the nomination of external panel members. The omission, and subsequent delay, is a major obstacle to the Academic Office in making arrangements for an event.

Since February 2014, an employer representative is normally included on Panels convened to consider Foundation degree proposals.

Internals

In June of each year, the Academic Office writes to Heads of School asking them to update the list of staff nominated to serve as internal Panel members (requesting four per school) and reminds them of the need to ensure that the staff nominated are informed of the nomination and are willing to participate. For 2018/19 a list of Ulster staff with HEA membership was provided to Heads of School to inform their nominations. The Office held a briefing seminar in early autumn for nominees to update them on University policies and procedures in relation to evaluation and revalidation. One implication from the delay of events into late Semester two is that many of the internal panel members cite high workload pressures at that time as the reason for their non-availability.

Student Representation

Since 2011/12, a Students' Union Officer (from a pool nominated by the Student Representation Coordinator) has been included in all revalidation panels (excluding collaborative provision).

As the Students' Union remit does not include Associate Students in its membership, it is not involved in panels for collaborative (validated and franchised) provision. Given that there are no full-time officers in partner institutions, class representatives are considered best placed to act in this role. HE Coordinators identify a student representative for each event. The briefing of student representatives is usually undertaken by the Faculty Partnership Managers and/or the Academic Office staff.

f) Faculty Co-ordination of Evaluation/Revalidation Activity

For revalidations, Unit Co-ordinators are appointed by Faculties. The Co-ordinator acts as the central contact person for liaison with the Academic Office and other departments. For evaluation, the chair of the course planning committee is the contact.

For college provision, Faculty Partnership Managers (FPM)/Heads of Partnership (HoP - QAHE) are asked to provide preliminary comments on the Faculty's engagement with College course/subject teams and in the preparation of the submission. They are also invited to attend for the duration of the evaluation and revalidation meeting, including the private meeting of the panel (unless also acting as Unit Co-ordinator).

Panels for collaborative proposals are required to make a recommendation regarding the minimum/maximum cohort size for new/existing courses. This recommendation should be based on the resources made available by the institution to support delivery of the programme. The relevant FPM/HoP completes a report (CA4 form) (in advance of validation meetings) confirming the Faculty's recommendation cohort size for new proposals and whether this needs to be adjusted for courses undergoing revalidation in the light of any changes in resources. Details of the articulation of the Foundation degree to Honours degree programmes and the proposed entry standard are also provided. CA4 forms are distributed, with other preliminary comments to partner institutions, in advance of the meeting.

FPMs/HoPs have been reminded of the need to include on the CA4 form, for consideration by the panel, the recommended cohort size for each mode and site.

For the validation of Foundation degrees, Faculty Partnership Managers identify, as an articulation route, an Honours degree programme(s) at Ulster for students who successfully complete the Foundation degree programme. Such a progression route is a defining characteristic in the Foundation degree benchmark statement. Faculty Partnership Managers keep these under review through ongoing liaison with the Course Directors of validated Foundation degree programmes and the related Honours degree programmes at the University to ensure that existing articulation routes remain appropriate and are revised as necessary following any changes made to provision by CA3 during their period of approval.

g) Central Department Reports and Monitoring of Resources

Library and IT reports are provided for new provision being evaluated or where it is proposed that existing provision undergoing revalidation is to be delivered at a new campus or by a new partner institution.

ADDL provides reports for any proposed new fully online provision for all panels; this includes an overview of the engagement of the team with ADDL and provides an assessment of the readiness of staff and the online materials etc. for the

proposed start date. When a presentation by ADDL is built into the validation programme, this focuses on the course support area and the ADDL representative should be accompanied by at least one key course/subject team member.

Where a Panel sets conditions of approval relating to Library, IT or fully online provision, relevant staff from these departments receive a copy of the Panel report and are asked to provide the Academic Office with a follow-up review report in advance of the intake to the programme, for consideration by the Panel Chair and APAG, if appropriate.

h) Inspection of Resources – Multi-Campus/College Events

Where provision is spread across a number of campuses or colleges, arrangements are made for a separate preliminary inspection of specialist resources (library, equipment, laboratories etc.) by an external member of the panel, guided by the Revalidation Unit Co-ordinator (who may have a dual role as FPM) or the Chair of Course Planning Committee. This is undertaken in advance of the Panel meeting. If an inspection of all or some sites is not possible, a report is provided by the FPM/HoP.

For new collaborative proposals Faculty assessments (CA2) are reviewed by APAG. Given that Colleges often bring forward, for consideration by Revalidation Panels, proposals to deliver existing programmes at new sites, the CA4 form, received by Panels, should include an assessment by the relevant FPM of the adequacy of the physical and human resources at each proposed site of delivery, and a recommendation regarding cohort size by mode at each proposed site. The Panel uses this information to help determine the adequacy of resources and makes its recommendation for approval to ASQEC accordingly.

Where several campuses are involved, visits to all by externals are normally only now required where specialist resources are needed for delivery (subject to appropriate arrangements to meet students).

In many cases, Colleges do not buy additional resources until the course is approved. In respect of the Library, the relevant University subject librarian is expected to liaise with the College librarian and provides ongoing reports. As required under the procedures for the monitoring of resources, an audit of resources is undertaken at an appropriate time, prior to the commencement of the course or next intake, to ensure that the necessary resources are in place (see 4g) above).

i) Preliminary Comments

Panel members are invited to submit preliminary comments (CA7 form) on the submission for distribution to Panel members and the Faculty in advance of the meeting. In 2018/19, the majority of documents were submitted on time (see section j) and preliminary comments were received for the majority of events held.

Academic Office notes on the submission were provided only to the Chair in advance of the meeting and include a summary of key issues, relevant extracts from the CA1/2 proposal form (where applicable) and identify standards and regulatory matters. All Panel members and the Course/Subject team receive a list of the standards and regulatory matters on the day of the meeting.

j) Documentation for Events

The deadline for the receipt of revalidation documentation for cross-campus/College provision is four weeks in advance of the Panel meeting and for all single course events, the deadline is three weeks. In 2018/19, most submissions were received by, or within one week of, the deadline. The documentation for internal events was generally submitted close to the submission date but for some events the documents were submitted very close to the date of the event and the Academic Office wrote to apologise to Panel members and, in one case, the professional body decided not to participate in the event.

The Office continues to provide as much support as possible to staff using CMS for the preparation and revision of validation documentation and a session on CMS was organised as part of the evaluation/revalidation briefing seminar in September 2018 and in two briefings for faculty professional support staff. The amount of pre-event support sought from the Academic Office in relation to the compilation of course/subject documentation in CMS appears to be reducing as academic staff, and other users, become more experienced in its use.

SharePoint sites were set up for events through which Panel logged in to access all the materials for their event. Panel members were asked to bring their own laptops and the Academic Office arranged for vCodes for the external visitors so that they could access the University's Wi-Fi in the meeting room.

All Revalidation Unit Co-ordinators/Chairs of Course Planning Committees for internal events scheduled for validation in 2018/19 submitted documentation through the CMS and the documentation was shared with Panel members etc. through SharePoint. The Academic Office, whenever access to Wi-Fi in partner institutions permitted, made arrangements for Panel members to view documentation in SharePoint and documentation was emailed for download to panel members' devices.

k) Programme

Since 2008/9, a meeting with a representative group of students (to include class representatives) has been included in the programme for revalidation events. The Academic Office issues guidance, 'Revalidation Information for Students', to the Unit Coordinator in advance of the meeting for provision to each student attending to ensure that they understand the purpose of the event and their role at the meeting. Coordinators are asked to provide for the Panel, the name, year group and course of each student attending.

Meetings with students continue to work well. They assist panels in judging the effectiveness of the teaching and assessment methods, and allow members to obtain views on curriculum development. Unit Coordinators are asked to ensure, as far as possible, that the students selected to meet Panels are representative – not only in terms of the course of study, year group and mode of attendance but also where possible in terms of academic achievement.

Library tours and visits to specialist facilities continue to be conducted only for new internal provision and for all provision in partner institutions.

l) Approval of Final Documents

At the December 2017 meeting of ASQEC, the Committee agreed that it would consider approval of courses only after the evaluation or revalidation document had been signed off by the chairs of panels. The Committee noted that some approvals would, therefore, be undertaken by Chair's Action in the summer. If a document had not been signed off the Chair might exceptionally permit admission. This would only be possible where Faculties had proven appropriate progress in addressing the conditions and recommendations of the validation panel and where the viability of the provision had been established.

Final documents for new courses/revalidated units are submitted for consideration by the Academic Office and final approval by the Panel chair. The deadline is, from 2018/19, normally six weeks after the event (eight weeks for large units) or four weeks for events held after 31 May. The Academic Office aims to ensure final documents are 'signed off' by the Panel Chair before a course starts, but the late timing of some events means that the checking of final documents may be delayed. This can affect preparations for Semester one events in the next academic year. The Academic Office sends a statement on outstanding documents to Faculties (Associate Deans, Heads of School, Faculty Administrative staff and FPMs as appropriate) at regular intervals, so that appropriate action may be taken in relation to overdue documentation. ASQEC receives a progress report at each meeting. As noted at a) above the reduction to the period for resubmission has appeared to help in achieving more timely completion.

Conditions and recommendations of Panels are rarely fully or clearly addressed in the first revised submissions and further amendments are usually required.

Module Office staff have access to course/module information on the CMS and are copied into the final evaluation/revalidation approval notification from the Academic Office. The Module Office will then review any new module codes automatically assigned in the CMS to ensure they are appropriate and if necessary, revise them. Revalidation Unit Co-ordinators/Chairs of Course Planning Committees are reminded by the Academic Office of the need to liaise with the Module Office regarding 'final' module codes following final approval of the revised documentation through CMS.

m) Size and Composition of Revalidation Units

The feasibility of Panels confirming the validity of all courses and modules, particularly in very large units, has previously been a concern. A review of the composition and the size of units in 2006 led to an overall increase in the number of units, the aim being to make it more manageable for Panels to confirm the validity of all courses and modules. Proposals to reduce the number of units in four of the then six faculties were agreed by the Course Approval Sub-Committee at its meeting in February 2015. This resulted in an overall reduction in the total number of units from 186 to 160 (now 155). Concern regarding the size of revalidation units and level of scrutiny of courses was also voiced during 2017/18 and the Academic Office now utilises 60 modules as indicative of the upper size limit for a revalidation event. Unit size continues to be discussed with Associate Deans (Education) for future events.

5 PANEL REPORTS

a) Reports

Final course approval is delegated by Senate to ASQEC. The Committee considers Panel recommendations for the period of approval in a summary report. Chair's action is taken in respect of provision where the document is not signed off before the last ASQEC meeting of the year. Panel reports are published on the 'Programme Approval' area of the Academic Office web pages.

b) Conditions and Recommendations

The following is a compilation of conditions/recommendations from across all reports of events held in 2018/19. One condition set by all Panels was the need to address the regulatory and standards matters identified by the Academic Office and most Panels set a small number of other conditions and identified a small number of recommendations. The majority of issues identified by panels related to assessment and feedback (iv below) and only a few panels raised matters related to support for students (v).

i) Recruitment and Marketing

- Develop a clear marketing strategy to increase student numbers across campuses;
- Revise cohort sizes in the final document to reflect the recommendations of a minimum enrolment size;
- Clearly represent the programme structure in the promotion of the course to reflect the different optional modules available on each campus;
- Expand upon the policy for work-based learning opportunities, particularly around unpaid opportunities, and aligned with the programme's promotion and information for applicants;
- Consider revision of module titles to help demonstrate contemporary developments and support employment opportunities in the subject area;

- Enlist the services of the Department of Global Recruitment and Engagement to design a robust marketing strategy targeting international students;
- Maximise the use of student and alumni testimonials in marketing and published course material;
- Review marketing and recruitment activities, drawing upon all available resources, in order to satisfy that the projected minimum student intake is achievable;
- Consider the provision of short courses for CPD opportunities using elements of existing modules and also development of taster modules.

ii) Content and Standards

- Make the coherence and integration of modules and the progression between levels explicit;
- Make more explicit the level differentiation between Level 6 and 7 module learning outcomes;
- Review the learning outcomes in the Level 7 modules to ensure that they are appropriate to that level;
- Redesign programme learning outcomes to ensure that they are specific and distinct from one another;
- Include specific, level-appropriate learning outcomes in all module descriptions, in line with curriculum design principles;
- Detail steps to be taken to enhance links with industry and employers;
- Undertake a mapping of the programme to professional body requirements for accreditation;
- Keep the employability module under review with a view to how employability is embedded throughout the programmes and not only as a stand-alone module;
- Articulate more clearly the academic rigour within the module descriptions;
- Establish a formal Industrial Advisory Board comprising local employers, which meets three times per annum, to advise on the curriculum and matters such as marketing and work-based learning;
- Elaborate on the content of module descriptions to reflect contemporary issues such as: globalisation, sustainability, compliance, auditing, security and consumer behaviour.

iii) Learning and Teaching

- Revise reading lists to ensure that they are more closely linked with module content;
- Clearly articulate the development of students' employability skills;
- Review the contact hours for timetabled sessions to reflect the developing pedagogic approaches associated with 'flipped learning' and develop a shared approach to the support for students to structure their independent learning hours.

iv) Assessment and Feedback

- Review the assessment and feedback strategy in line with the Curriculum Design Principles; provide rationale to clarify the scaffolding nature of overall assessment structure; and provide rationale for each module with more than two items of assessment;
- Clearly articulate the assessment strategy within each module providing details of component parts, word count and notional hours;
- Review the assessment strategy to ensure the number and range of assessments are appropriate;
- Review the volume of assessment with the aim of ensuring high quality output while enabling a reduction in student workloads;
- Make more explicit what would be required of students in order to successfully complete written assessment assignments at each level;
- Ensure that, in line with the University's electronic management of assessment and feedback policy, where appropriate, assessment and feedback are delivered using online technology and that a consistent approach is taken across the provision;
- Review assessment load taking account of the University's 'Assessment Workload Equivalence guide';
- Review the exemplar assessment map to ensure students are not asked to complete more than two assessment items in any given week;
- Clarify the teaching schedule and deadline for assessment (bunching of assessments);
- Reconsider the number of assessment components in the portfolio element of the work-based module;
- Clearly articulate formative assessment in the documentation.

v) Support for Students

- Expand on student induction and student support within the course document;
- Review the ways in which induction might be staged across each semester and each level, paying particular attention to the induction arrangements for part-time students;
- Review and refresh the student-facing VLE and course area;
- Communicate the existence of a subject society at induction with a view to building an overall student community identity;
- Develop a sustained means of tracking the development of employability for students to allow them to develop an evidence base to take to employers;
- Review the preparation for Work Placement to ensure it is foregrounded as part of first year;
- Consider introducing more contact opportunities with students on Work-Based Learning placements through additional visits or Skype calls etc;
- Clarify support arrangements for students studying fully online.

vi) Resources and Staff Development

- Keep resources under review in line with the forecast growth in international student numbers, the extensive use of part-time staff, recognised teachers and e-tutors;
- Clearly identify the staffing plan;
- Provide confirmation that library resources are in place prior to course commencement;
- Draw up a schedule for software upgrade cycles;
- Ensure that staff resources and their future development are kept under review: to include CPD opportunities and part-time PhD study;
- Ensure that there is an increased utilisation of research databases and e-books and students are sign-posted to current research articles and journals;
- Review and refresh the current student-facing VLE and course area on Moodle (College);
- Keep student/staff access to wifi under review at all sites;
- Support staff to become more active in relevant professional and academic networks;
- Continue to monitor the staff resource in light of the dependency on a few individuals to deliver the bulk of the programme and the student recruitment plans;
- Review the currency and length of reading lists.

Faculties and course teams preparing for future events will wish to take account of these matters.

6 STUDENT VIEWS

Meetings with students are scheduled as part of the revalidation event programme.

Generally, the feedback received from students at revalidation meetings has been very positive, with their respective programme of study having met their expectations. Many very favourable comments were made in relation to the variety of learning, teaching and assessment, the useful feedback provided, the approachability and supportiveness of staff, the valuable placement experience and materials available on Blackboard.

The willingness of the student group attending events to raise issues is helped by the presence of a student representative on the Panel and the training undertaken by internal SU Officers. The following listing compiles suggested enhancements or less positive comments raised by students in the meetings held with Revalidation Panels:

i) Organisation and Delivery

- Some students commented that some modules were notable as 'unchallenging';
- Students noted repetition of content in different modules;
- Timetable issued too late and, at the outset, was difficult to negotiate;

- No consistency in the provision of lecture notes in advance of lectures or in the manner provided (e-mail/BBL);
- No understanding of the process for the allocation of final year projects;
- No opportunity to meet the external examiner;
- Placement site unprepared for the arrival of a student;
- Course commencement was delayed for two weeks to facilitate late applicants;
- Difficulty contacting academic staff who deliver on multiple campuses.

ii) Assessment and Feedback

- Concerns over the amount and scheduling of submission of assessments;
- Issues of the bunching of assessment submission;
- Students favoured online electronic assessments as they felt that feedback would be immediate;
- Feedback was not always provided promptly after the first assignment in time to guide a student in the second assignment;
- Quality of feedback was variable;
- Students were unaware how to get feedback on examinations;
- Apparent 'harshness' in the marking of a particular module;
- A minority of students expressed reservations about the use of groupwork assessment and peer assessment, particularly dealing with differing attitudes and work ethics.

iii) Resources

- Students advised that they would welcome the provision of quiet study areas and commented that the library was often too noisy;
- Students considered that the software available in the partner institution needed updating;
- Students studying online sought a wider selection of online journals;
- Students noted that the Moodle VLE had become cluttered with out of date calendars;
- Some students at outcentres considered that there were not enough core and recommended texts in the library compared to those available to Ulster campus based students.

Faculties and course teams preparing for future events should take account of these matters.

7 KEY AREAS DISCUSSED WITH COURSE/SUBJECT TEAMS

In 2018/19, Panels were asked to explore with teams, and look for evidence of, the extent to which teams addressed the curriculum design principles and those discussions are clearly evident both within reports and in the associated conditions of approval.

Panel chairs were reminded of the need to explore the following key areas with course/subject teams at evaluation/revalidation meetings:

- Curriculum Design Principles
- Assessment and Feedback for Learning
- WBL, Engagement with Industry, Placement and Employability
- Staffing
- Move to Belfast
- Digital Literacy
- Creativity, Innovation and Good Practice
- Student Experience Principles
- Graduate Qualities
- Research/Scholarship Informed Teaching
- Internationalisation of the Curriculum

In 2018/19, the vast majority of Panel reports included a substantial section outlining points of commendation; more identified strengths than creativity and innovation matters.

Panels continued to explore how the Principles of Assessment and Feedback for Learning were being embedded in the provision and, in particular, the arrangements for feedback at course/subject and module level. Panel reports included evidence of substantial discussion of assessment and feedback matters.

Some reports included evidence of consideration/discussion of student experience and employability matters and the internationalisation of the curriculum.

Where any of the above areas/sections were omitted from the validation documentation, this was a matter to be addressed as a Panel condition and final documentation was to include statements on these areas. All internal validation documentation is accessible in CMS by all staff and CHERP can research, for example, creativity, innovation and the research/scholarship commentary sections.

Panels will continue to be encouraged in 2019/20 to explore with Course/Subject Teams their preparation process, engagement with the Curriculum Design Framework, innovative approaches to learning and teaching, assessment and feedback, employability, research/scholarship informed teaching and the internationalisation of the curriculum.

8 CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The Curriculum Management System (CMS) was developed to host in an electronic format, a single authoritative source of programme and module information and streamline the business processes involved in approval. It supports the preparation of documentation for evaluation and revalidation as well as course revisions.

2018/19 was the fifth year using CMS for evaluation and revalidation, and only a small number of internal courses have not yet used it for this purpose (having received extensions to approval).

The CMS has continued to work well for the submission and final approval of validation documentation for events in 2018/19 and staff continue to become more familiar with the system.

The Academic Office often responds to calls/emails from staff seeking advice on the CMS and, as well as giving verbal assistance, direct staff to detailed set-by-step guidance available on the CMS site for help with basic operations. A small number of staff encountered technical problems such as information not saving and apparent data loss when compiling documentation. Such technical difficulties are referred to the ISD Service Desk for resolution by the externally contracted supplier if appropriate. Although infrequent, these have a large impact on the staff concerned. Subsequently staff have reported issues in terms of timeliness of response and adequacy of the technical solution provided.

9 2019/20 EVALUATION/REVALIDATION SCHEDULE

CA6 preparation forms for 2019/20 revalidation events were forwarded to Associate Deans for completion by early February 2019 so that Revalidation Unit Co-ordinators could be identified at an early stage to allow sufficient time for preparation. The vast majority of CA6 forms have been received with a small number of these needing to identify proposed external Panel members.

Currently, 34 events involving 97 courses are scheduled for 2019/20; 33 events are revalidations involving 96 courses) and a single-course evaluation event. The number of evaluation events is expected to increase given that additional course proposals are likely to be approved by APAG to proceed to planning and evaluation for a January or September 2020 start.

The size of units will be affected by outcomes from CAQE which allow exemption from revalidation.

Gary Kendall
17.10.19

REVALIDATION SCHEDULE BY SUBJECT UNIT AND SUB-UNIT: 2019/20 – 2023/24

YEAR WITHIN CYCLE	III 2019/20	IV 2020/21	V 2021/22	I 2022/23	II 2023/24
FACULTY					
Art, Humanities & Social Sciences Units: 40	7D Digital Arts & Tech (SWC) 9A1 PGCE 9F Education (Minor) 13 General Hum (SRC) 26F1 Social Work (pre-qual) (ME) 26F2 Social Work (pre-qual) Colleges) 26K Policing (ug/PSNI) 27A Sociology (ug)	30B1 Access (Social Scs/NRC) 30B3 Access (Social Scs/NWRC) 26L Prof Teaching (PSNI) 30B2 Access (Social Scs2/SRC) 30B4 Access (Social Scs/SWC) 19B Media Studies (pg) 19Ai Interactive Media (ug)	2A Fine Art/Photo (ug/pg) 2B Animation, G/I Design (ug/pg) 2C Applied (Arts/ug) 21 Music (ug/pg) 18 Law (ug/pg) 26J Prison Custody (ug/NIPS)	2K Design (ug) 9B TESOL (pg) 9C2 Library Info Mgt (pg) 11 English (CE/SRC/oc) 14 History (ug/pg) 17A Irish (ug/pg) 17B Irish (ug/SRC) 19Aii Journalism (ug) 2L Art Therapy (pg) 26A Community Stds (ug/pg) 26C Politics/Social Policy (ug/pg) 26D Politics (H & Soc Care Man) (pg/Trusts) 26G Social Work (pg)	6A Communication (ug/pg) 6B Counselling (Colleges) 7A Drama/Cinematics (ug/pg) 7B Music, Sound &Tech (ug) 7E Museum Studies (ug/pg) 9A2 Educ (CIT/PgC Educ (FE)) 9C1 Education (Prof Dev)
Computing, Engineering & Built Environment Units: 29	4D Civil & Env Eng (SWC) 10A1 Engineering (BEng/MEng) 10A2 Engineering (ug) 10A3 Engineering (pg) 10B1 Engineering (SWC) 16E Engineering (ME)	4 Built Env 4F Civil Eng (NWRC) 4H Energy & Bldg Services Eng (ug) (HKU SPACE)	4B Arch Techn/Constr Eng (Colleges) 4E Property & Planning (BMC) 16Aiii Data Science (pg)	2G Arch (ug/pg) 4G Civil Eng (BMC) 16Ai Computing (ME/pg) 16B1 Computing (JN/ug) 16B2 Internet of Things (JN/ug) 16D Computing (ME/ug)	10B2 Engineering (NRC/SERC) 10B3 Engineering(SERC/SRC) 10B4 Engineering (NWRC) 16Aii Computing (QAHE) 16G1 Computing (BMC/SRC) 16G2 Computing (SRC) 16G3 Computing (NRC) 16G4 Computing / IT (NWRC) 16G5 Computing (SERC) 16G6 Computing (SWC)
Life & Health Sciences Units:44	3CA Pharm (ug/pg) 3C1b Biomed Sc (Joint/Sligo) 12A Env Studies (ug/pg) 12C Equine Man (CAFRE) 22A1 Nursing (pre-reg) 22B1 Specialist Nursing Practice (post-reg) 22C Nursing (pg) 22D	3A Bioscience (ug) 3C2C Phy Assoc Studies (pg) 12D Horticulture (CAFRE) 12E Agric (CAFRE) 22G Healthcare (Dev Pr) (ug/pg) 22J Health & Soc Care (Network) 28Da Optometry/Clin Optom (ug) 28Db Indep Prescrib (pg) 30D Access (Scs) (NWRC)	3C4B Pharm Mgt (ug) 25A Psychology (ug/pg) 25B Combined Social & Behavioural Sc (BMC)	3C2Ai Biomed Sc (pg) 3C2Aii Biotech Research (pg) 3C2B Cat & Ref Surg/Phy Assoc (pg) 3G EU Reg Affairs (pg/DL UCD/UCC) 22B2 Spec CPHN (post reg) 22H Drug & Alch (ug/NWRC) 28Gi Sport (ug)	3B2 <u>Strat Med (ug/pg)</u> 3C1a <u>Biomed Sc.(ug/pg)</u> 3C3 App Ind Scs (SRC) 3C5 App Med Scs (Colleges) 3D Food, Nutrition & Dietetics 3E Nutrition (ug/pg/HK) 3F Food (CAFRE) 22E Nursing Edn (pg) 28H Sport (Network)

YEAR WITHIN CYCLE	III 2019/20	IV 2020/21	V 2021/22	I 2022/23	II 2023/24
FACULTY					
	22F Nursing (Non-Med Prescrib) Health & Wellbeing/ Health (ug/pg) 22K Paramedic (ug/NIAS) 28B Healthcare/Physio (ug)	30E Access (Scs) (NRC)		28Gii Sport (pg) 28Giii Sport Medicine (pg) 28M Health Professions (ug)	28L Adv.Practice / Prescribing / Lower Limb (pg)*
UU Business School Units: 38	1Ai Accounting (ug/JN) 1Aii Accounting (ug/QAHE) 1C Accounting (SRC) 5Ei Int Business (pg) 5Eii Int Business (pg/QAHE) 5F1 Bus Improvement (pg/oc - HSC) 5H Man & Corp Gov (ug/JN) 5Q Lead Man (SERC) 5R Bus & Enterprise (NWRC) 15B Hospitality (pg/BT) 15C Hospitality (Colleges) 15F H&T (SERC)	5B1ai Bus Stds/Bus Dev & Innov (ug/JN) 5B1aii Bus Stds (ug/QAHE) 5B1b Bus Tech (ug/JN) 5B3 Man Practice (ug/JN/o/c) 5B4 Customer Contact (ug) 5C4 Social Enterprise (ug) 5F2 HRM (pg/JN) 5K Ex L'ship (pg/JN) 15D Hosp./Event/Tour (BMC) 15G Intl Hospitality (HTMi)	5J Innov Man Public Serv (ME/Letterkenny)	1B Acctg, Fin & Ecs (ug/pg/JN/oc) 1E Accounting (ug/BMC) 5C1 HRM/Mgt & L'ship (UG/JN) 5Di Global Bus & Ent (ug/ME) 5Dii Business (ug) (AQHE) 5Gi MBA/MSc (pg) 5Gii MBA (QAHE) 5P Marketing (ug/BMC) 15A Hospitality (ug/BT/CE)	5B2 Civic L'ship (ug/JN) 5Lai Marketing (ug/pg) 5LAii Marketing (pg/QAHE) 5M Fin/Bus Serv (SWC) 5N Bus/Digital Tech (NRC)
Access, Digital & Distributed Learning Units: 4		31C Higher Ed Practice (PgCHEP)	31B Foundation Studies (Dip)		31Cii Higher Ed Practice 31D Prof Practice (PG Cert)
TOTAL: 155	38	28	14	38	37