# EDINBURGH NAPIER INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW

## EVIDENCE-INFORMED SELF EVALUATION REPORT

## Guidance

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. This report should be supplemented by an evidence-base to be made available to the reviewers and used by the programme team as you prepare the report. You should cross reference to this evidence in the commentary below to signpost the review team to the supporting information which provides greater context. Work is underway to develop ILR-specific dashboards in Cognos to allow teams to draw upon data and sources of evidence with greater ease.

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.

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)
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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)
 |
|  |

## SECTION TWO: PROVISION OVERVIEW, INCLUDING STUDENT & STAFF COMPOSITION

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to 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 specifications 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 have been designed in this way.
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to provide an *overview* of the key features of the student population who study on the programmes under review – for example overall student population trends; full-time/part-time balance; gender balance trends; % direct entrants (UG programmes); % students from MD20/40 backgrounds (UG programme) - [See Cognos Student Profile Dashboard](https://businessintelligence.napier.ac.uk/ibmcognos/bi/?pathRef=.public_folders%2FStudent%2BEnrolments%2FILR%2BStudent%2BProfile%2BReport)). This is an opportunity to introduce the review team to the composition of your student population and the challenges and opportunities that this presents
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to provide an *overview* of the staff who contribute to the delivery and support of the programmes under review (brief summary of expertise and responsibilities) and to share how the staffing of the programmes, including how staff:student ratios are 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. How do staff in professional service departments contribute to teaching and supporting learning within the programmes under review (if applicable)?
 |
|  |

## SECTION THREE: STRATEGIC APPROACH TO LEARNING, TEACHING & ENHANCEMENT

|  |
| --- |
| 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 extent to which the programmes within the scope of this review are engaging with the University’s Curriculum Enhancement Framework (ENhance). You should consider the following prompts to support this reflection, and provide links to supporting evidence and examples in the report:1. Does the curriculum demonstrate a proactive approach to engaging students in their learning?
2. Are learning opportunities related to the ENhance themes (employability; sustainability; inclusion; global outlook; research and practice integration) clearly and coherently woven throughout the programme in its content; opportunities for students; learning design, learning and teaching approaches; assessment design and activities; and/or general direction of curriculum development?
3. Are the cross-cutting themes of citizenship and community and digital and information literacies evident in the curriculum?
4. Are you confident that the embedding of the theme is resilient to changing circumstances (ie. not wholly dependent on a single member of staff; or a single module)?

Further guidance available from: <https://staff.napier.ac.uk/services/dlte/GSCF/Pages/GSCF.aspx>How has the strategy influenced changes to the programmes under review since they were last approved/reapproved? |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Comment on how the academic standard of the provision under review is safeguarded and managed on an ongoing basis. It is anticipated that this section will draw upon your approach to ensuring that the programme specifications (the appendices in particular) and the module descriptors and module descriptors are up-to-date.

You should consider how the provision takes account of external reference points in setting and monitoring the standard of the provision (for example, the Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework (SCQF); UK Quality Code, subject benchmark statements; professional, statutory and regulatory body requirements). Do the programmes under review fully comply with the University academic regulations? You should demonstrate how you ensure that the learning outcomes for the programmes under review (and for any exit awards included as part of this provision) are appropriate and remain aligned to the programme aims. How do the learning, teaching and assessment approaches enable students to achieve the programme and exit learning outcomes? |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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?
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Provide information about the approaches used by students to provide the programme team with feedback on their learning experience (including module evaluation; SSLCs; national student surveys etc). Is this the same across all provision under review? How effective are these approaches? 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?
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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?
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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?
 |
|  |

## SECTION FOUR: 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 student employment/further study destinations 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? (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.
 |
| . |

## SECTION FIVE: 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; 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.  |
|  |

## 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 the ongoing enhancement of the provision under review.
 |
|  |

## SECTION SEVEN: STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT/ FIVE YEAR VISION

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Use this section to 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.

Please provide a summary of strengths identified while preparing for the review. Please provide a summary of areas which would benefit from further development into the future.  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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

### Evidence-base to be made available to Review Panel via Sharepoint must include as a minimum:

* Updated and School-approved Programme Specifications for all provision under consideration
* Updated and School approved Module descriptors for all relevant modules within the programme structures under consideration (module descriptors for all compulsory modules should be available)
* Updated programme enhancement plan (required as part of Annual Monitoring & Review since 2022/23 academic session)
* Programme Annual Reports for all programmes under consideration for the whole review cycle (5 years)
* A sample of module evaluation reports from the previous 12 months with an explanation as to why these were selected as a sample
* Cognos Programme Performance data for all provision under consideration (this may have been appended to the annual reports above)
* Key features of the student population (for example, student gender balance across programmes; proportion of direct entrants; proportion of widening participation students etc.)
* A sample of minute extracts from School meetings where programme changes have been considered and approved during the review period
* Minutes from Programme Boards of Studies for the period of review
* External Examiner reports, and responses to them (if applicable)
* Collaborative programme first year review report/s (if applicable)
* Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body reports (if relevant)
* Most recent MyProgramme documents
* Screenshots of Programme Moodle pages for provision under consideration (read only access to the Moodle courses and links would be helpful)