This report template is intended to support programme teams in their critical and evidence-based reflections and to introduce the review team to the provision under review, in accordance with the full guidance available from [Section 2b of the Quality Framework](https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/quality/qualityframework/Pages/qualityframework.aspx). Institution-Led Review must be evidence-based and take full account of the outcomes of any monitoring or review activities, including accreditation, re-accreditation, or monitoring activities undertaken by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies, which have taken place since the date of initial approval or, where applicable, the previous formal review event. It should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of University annual monitoring and review activities and how these inform the ongoing enhancement of the provision. As such, this report should be informed by and supplemented with an evidence-base to be made available to the reviewers and used by the programme team as you prepare the report. **There is no need to replicate information in this report if it exists in the evidence base available to the ILR panel**, rather you should cross reference to the evidence in the report below to signpost the review team to the supporting information which provides the detail and use this document to focus on the impact (the ‘so what?’).

The table below is intended to allow you to confirm that you have accessed, utilised and shared the evidence and provide some additional contextual notes, if applicable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide the url for the Sharepoint Site | <<Paste in url>> |
|  | **Evidence Item** |  | **Notes** For example explanation for choice of sample/justification for gaps |
| A | Updated and School-approved provision records (from CME) for all programmes under consideration |[ ]   |
| B | Updated and School-approved module reports for all relevant modules within programme structures (compulsory modules must be presented) |[ ]   |
| C | Updated programme enhancement plan(s) (required as part of annual monitoring and review (since 2022/23) |[ ]   |
| D | Programme annual reports for all programmes under consideration for the whole review cycle (5/6 years) |[ ]   |
| E | Sample of module evaluation reports from previous 12 months – provide explanation as to why the sample was selected |[ ]   |
| F | Cognos Data* [Student ILR Profile Report](https://businessintelligence.napier.ac.uk/ibmcognos/bi/?perspective=authoring&id=iD1EF19B4ED9F4D3BB13354EACEBE1DEA&objRef=iD1EF19B4ED9F4D3BB13354EACEBE1DEA&action=run&format=spreadsheetML&cmPropStr=%7B%22id%22%3A%22iD1EF19B4ED9F4D3BB13354EACEBE1DEA%22%2C%22type%22%3A%22report%22%2C%22defaultName%22%3A%22ILR%20Student%20Profile%20Report%22%2C%22permissions%22%3A%5B%22execute%22%2C%22read%22%2C%22traverse%22%5D%7D)
* [Cognos Programme Performance Report](https://businessintelligence.napier.ac.uk/ibmcognos/bi/?perspective=authoring&id=i7F8FF567475944AFB9B8181247DCCC30&objRef=i7F8FF567475944AFB9B8181247DCCC30&action=run&format=PDF&cmPropStr=%7B%22id%22%3A%22i7F8FF567475944AFB9B8181247DCCC30%22%2C%22type%22%3A%22report%22%2C%22defaultName%22%3A%22Programme%20Performance%20Dashboard%22%2C%22permissions%22%3A%5B%22execute%22%2C%22read%22%2C%22traverse%22%5D%7D)

(If Cognos is not providing the data you would expect to see, for example for TNE programmes – contact Planning & Business Support for assistance – planning@napier.ac.uk)  |[ ]   |
| G | Sample of minute extracts from School meetings where programme changes have been considered and approved during the review periodMinutes of the School meeting(s) where the module and programme information to be presented to this ILR was scrutinised and approved must be included in the sample. |[ ]   |
| H | Minutes relating to Programme Management over the review period* Programme Boards of Study (for period of review)
* SSLC Minutes/Action Tables (for period of review)
 |[ ]   |
| I | External examiner reports (and responses to them, if applicable) for all programmes under review (for the period of the review)  |[ ]   |
| J | Additional information around the Quality Oversight of the Provision, for example PSRB reports (if applicable); first year review reports (if applicable for collaborative programmes)  |[ ]   |
| K | Most recent myProgramme documents |[ ]   |
| L | Screenshots of Programme Moodle pages  |[ ]   |
| Optional  |
| M | Evidence of stakeholder engagement activities prior to the ILR, if applicable |[ ]   |
|  | <<If you have other evidence sources to bring to the attention of the panel – detail them here>> |  |  |

As multiple programmes may be under review, you should ensure that the report is clear regarding whether information and examples are referring to all programmes, or individual programmes, and please avoid unnecessary duplication.

Throughout this template you should be explicit in highlighting good practice or innovative practice to bring to the attention of panel members. The sections are intended to be supportive prompts, however if you are confident you have provided a response within a different section, there is no requirement to duplicate information, please make use of cross-referencing between sections.

Information and content provided below may be extracted and included within the final report produced by the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement (DLTE) as an output for the review. The final report will be made available externally to the Quality Assurance Agency as part of the [Enhancement-led Review Methodology](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/quality-enhancement-framework/enhancement-led-institutional-review-%28elir%29).

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this template, please contact the Quality Team in the Department of Learning & Teaching Enhancement – quality@napier.ac.uk.

## Section One: Contextual Background & Preparation Approach

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide the full titles of all provision under consideration at this review (also include location if not delivered on campus) – and any relevant information on the status of the programmes to bring to the attention of the review team (eg.. programme recently approved; programme being taught out)

Sources: A (CME Provision Record) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide the names and job titles of key staff involved in preparing this report, including staff in professional service departments (if applicable)
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide the details of students (eg. programme, year, mode of study, direct entrant, etc.) who have had a key role in contributing to the preparation of this report (if applicable)
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide a brief summary of the approach taken to prepare for this review, including how you engaged programme teaching staff; programme support staff; students; professional support teams (such as Information Services; Student Futures; Student Mobility; International Operations; Academic Skills); external stakeholders (such as alumni; employers/industry and external partners).

**Importantly, please share any impact that this engagement has had in the lead-up to the ILR.**Probable evidence sources: M (Evidence of stakeholder engagement) |
|  |

## Section Two: Provision Overview, Including Student & Staff Composition

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide an overview of the provision under consideration, including relevant background information and context, and make clear how the programmes under consideration relate to each other. **This section should help the review team to navigate through the programme documentation presented**, and to understand the aims and purpose of the programmes under consideration. It would be helpful to highlight the distinctiveness of each programme under consideration and, where appropriate, to highlight any commonalities, and provide an explanation as to why the programmes and their curriculum have been designed in this way.

Probable sources of evidence: A; C; D; G; H (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual reports; minute extracts) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Consider the student population trends of your programme(s) How does the student demographic impact upon the management of the programme (for example, are you meeting School/University KPIs with respect to gender balance or widening participation? What opportunities/challenges are presented by the proportion of direct entrants?; Have there been changes in student demographic which has required changes to the programme approach?

**This is your opportunity to introduce the review team to the composition of your student population and the challenges and opportunities that this has presented over the review period.**Probable sources of evidence: C; D; E; F; H (programme enhancement plan(s); annual reports; cognos data; relevant minutes) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Reflect on the staffing resource and expertise in the delivery of the programmes. How are Staff:Student Ratios overseen and managed? How do you ensure that staff who contribute to the learning, teaching and assessment of the programme are sufficiently confident and supported in these roles?

Probable sources of evidence: C; D; H (programme enhancement plan(s); annual reports; relevant minutes) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What impact is made by the University’s Professional Services to the quality of the experience for students on your programme? Have you experienced challenges or identified concerns in the contributions offered by Professional Service teams? What contributions have you valued?

Probable sources of evidence: A; B; C; D; E; G; H (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual monitoring reports; relevant minutes) |
|  |

## Section Three: Strategic Approach To Learning, Teaching & Enhancement

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Set out the key contribution(s) of the programmes to the University’s Academic Strategy (see [https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/principal/strategy/Pages/universitystrategies.aspx),](https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/principal/University%20Strategy/Pages/University%20Strategy.aspx)

You should also use this section to set out (if not described elsewhere), the **impact** of the programmes’ engagement with the University’s Curriculum Enhancement Framework (ENhance) (see https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/GSCF/Pages/GSCF.aspx) (NB. your updated programme and module records should set out *how* you are engaging with the themes). How has the strategy influenced changes to the programmes under review since they were last approved/reapproved?Probable sources of evidence: A; B; C; D; E; G; H (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual monitoring reports; relevant minutes) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide information about how programme teams ensure programmes keep up to date with developments in research, industry/professional practice and pedagogy (including the use of technology in learning and teaching). What changes have been made to the programmes under review, since they were last approved/reapproved to demonstrate this?

Probable sources of evidence: A; B; C; D; E; G; H (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual monitoring reports; relevant minutes) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Reflect on the effectiveness of the approaches used by students to provide the programme team(s) with feedback on their learning experience (including module evaluation; SSLCs; national student surveys etc). Is this the same across all provision under review? What approaches do you use to ‘close the feedback loop’ with students? How do you know if this is effective? What changes have been made to the programmes under review as a result of student feedback?

Probable sources of evidence: H; K; L; D; E; G (Relevant minutes; myProgramme handbook; Moodle; annual monitoring reports) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on the quality of the learning environment (physical and virtual) across the provision under review to support students in achieving the learning outcomes. If programmes are delivered across different modes (including with partners) how does the programme team ensure equitability in the quality of the student experience?

Probable sources of evidence: H; K; L; D; E; G ((Relevant minutes; myProgramme handbook; Moodle; annual monitoring reports) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on the effectiveness of the assessment approaches and strategies in place across the provision (i.e. reflect on the diversity of approaches, how students are prepared for the assessment methods throughout their programmes; the balance of formative and summative assessment). How do you ensure that feedback provided to students is timely and of sufficient quality to support student learning? How does the programme team make use of external examiner feedback?

Probable sources of evidence: A; B; C; D; E; F; G; H; I (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual monitoring reports; relevant minutes; cognos data; external examiner feedback) |
|  |

## Section Four: Student Support & Guidance

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on the effectiveness of resources in place to support the student learning experience. This should include the availability of learning resources; and the contribution and role of the support services to the quality of the student experiences.

Consideration should be given to the effectiveness of student support throughout the learner journey (pre-application, induction (including students who study off campus, if appropriate); in making choices within their programmes (including encouragement to take-up mobility or placement opportunities); effectiveness of the support for a diverse student body etc.; effectiveness of the Personal Development Tutor system etc. and support in place for student success following graduation. Probable sources of evidence: D; E; H; K; L (annual monitoring reports; relevant minutes; myProgramme; Moodle) |
|  |

## Section Five: Student Outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on student retention and progression rates/trends for the provision under review and the mechanisms in place to support student progression (Data available from: [Programme Performance Dashboard available from Cognos](https://businessintelligence.napier.ac.uk/ibmcognos/bi/?pathRef=.public_folders%2FStudent+Performance%2FProgramme+Results+Analysis%2FProgramme+Performance+Dashboard&format=PDF&Download=false&prompt=true)) You should also draw on the evidence and ongoing evidence captured within annual monitoring reporting.
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on student achievement and trends in degree outcomes (Data available from: [Student Outcomes Dashboard available from Cognos](https://businessintelligence.napier.ac.uk/ibmcognos/bi/?perspective=dashboard&pathRef=.public_folders%2FStudent%2BPerformance%2FProgramme%2BResults%2BAnalysis%2FStudent%2BOutcomes%2BDashboard&action=view&mode=dashboard)). You should also draw on the evidence and ongoing evidence captured within annual monitoring reporting.
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on graduate outcome trends. To what extent do the programmes under review support students in developing the graduate attributes and wider higher level skills required for a changing workplace beyond University?

Probable sources of evidence: D; F; H (annual monitoring reports; cognos data; relevant minutes) |
|  |

## Section Six: Quality Enhancement & Assurance Of Standards

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on the effectiveness of the mechanisms in place for ongoing quality enhancement and assurance of the programmes under review (This could include governance arrangements for the programmes under review; the participation of students within these arrangements etc). You should also comment on the effectiveness of the annual monitoring and review processes and the impact that they have on safeguarding academic standards and the ongoing enhancement of the provision under review.

Probable sources of evidence: A; B; C; D (CME records; programme enhancement plan(s); annual monitoring reports) |
|  |

## Section Seven: Strategic Development/ Six Year Vision

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to briefly set out the future direction for the provision in line with ongoing University strategy and detail the extent to which the Programme Enhancement Plans (required since 2022/23 academic session) are supporting the implementation of these ambitions. .
 |
|  |

## Section Eight: Conclusion

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to share anything else you would like to bring to the attention of the review team.

For example, how has this review added value to you and the programme teams associated with this review? Did it surface any unexpected issues? Did it help you to identify new strengths?Has it helped to prioritise areas which would benefit from further development/support? |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **I confirm that this self-evaluation report can be submitted for consideration by the Institution-Led Review Panel**  |
| **Head of Learning & Teaching**  | **Signature**  | **Date** |

The report and additional supporting evidence must be provided to the School Support Service in accordance with timeframes set out within the Quality Framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Version Management** |  |
| Template Updated September 2023 | Approved subject to minor revisions following Quality & Standards Committee |