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# Introduction

* 1. The University of Hull is committed to maximising the satisfaction of all its students wherever they experience learning. This Code of Practice sets out the University of Hull’s requirements for the Developmental Engagement of taught provision.
  2. The purpose of the Developmental Engagement with Subjects (DES) process is to maintain academic standards and to assure and enhance the quality of learning opportunities for students through critical reflection on change over time within a subject area’s provision. The process requires critical reflection by those responsible for the Subject Area (e.g., heads of academic units and deans of faculties supported by module leaders, programme directors) on the student experience at subject level.
  3. The Developmental Engagement with Subject process builds on the University Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) process and allows programme teams to evaluate the outcomes of CMEE to inform longer term planning and development. It also allows subject areas and faculty teams to respond to evidence and feedback and propose enhancements so that students and the programme(s) can benefit from real time improvement. The Developmental Engagement with Subject process will draw conclusions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and consider whether subject areas are achieving what they set out to do and identify what could be done better or differently.
  4. The process is further informed by a range of key indicators as well as the views of external stakeholders, such as External Examiners and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).
  5. The outcomes of DES will be used to identify and share good and effective practice to inform University processes.
  6. The Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC) is responsible for the interpretation and implementation of this Code of Practice.

# Terminology

* 1. Throughout this Code of Practice, the term Subject Area (SA) is used to define the subject provider responsible for the provision being reviewed. It is acknowledged that this will not aways be a single school/department. Appropriate terminology **should** be agreed at the preliminary meeting and be used consistently throughout the Self Evaluation Template (SET), the review and all review reporting and action planning.

# Collaborative Provision

* 1. Please note that Collaborative Provision is not currently within the scope of this Code of Practice.

# Apprenticeship Provision

* 1. Apprenticeship provision is in scope given the focus of this Code of Practice is based on a review of the subject and the associated underpinning award. Given that all Apprenticeship provision is subject to annual curriculum review in accordance with the Scope of Practice Curriculum Review and Development, the most recent outcome report **must** be considered as part of the developmental engagement with subjects.

# Hull York Medical School Provision (HYMS)

* 1. The Hull York Medical School’s provision is exempt from DES. HYMS is subject to the periodic review process which takes place every six years and is conducted alternately by York and Hull.

# Stages of the review

* 1. Reviews will consist of the following stages:
  2. A **preliminary meeting** between the Subject Area (SA) and Quality Support Service (QSS) regarding the scope of the review and any specific organisational issues will take place no later than 3 months before the review date. This meeting will be organised by QSS. The date for the review **should** be agreed at this meeting.
  3. A **Self-Evaluation** produced by the SA in accordance with a pre-agreed template – approved in the preliminary meeting – to be submitted to the Secretary of the Review Panel no later than four weeks before the review day.
  4. A **briefing meeting** of the internal members of the Review Panel no later than two weeks before the review to identify areas of focus for each panel member.
  5. The **Review Day** will be one full day or concurrent half days and involve meetings between the Review Panel and staff and students representing the Subject Area. Oral feedback will be provided by the panel to the SA at the end of the day and provisional feedback will be provided in writing shortly after the review highlighting strengths, good practice and recommendations.
  6. A **report** drafted by the Secretary and approved by the members of the Review Panel will be provided to the SA no more than eight weeks after the review day. This first draft report is for comment on factual accuracy.
  7. The Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) will **approve** the final report - at its first meeting following finalisation of the report.
  8. An **action plan**, populated with actions arising from the recommendations of the Review Panel and completed by the SA (subject to factual accuracy) – to be produced for approval by QSC at the same time as approval of the report. The action plan will be monitored by the Faculty Education, Student Experience Committee (FESEC) via the relevant programme journal(s) as part of the University’s Continuous Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) process.
  9. **Feedback** to students on the outcomes of the review and actions planned in response will be communicated through the relevant student staff forum(s).

# The process of review

* 1. The Quality Support Service is responsible for ensuring that a schedule of Developmental Engagement with Subjects is maintained and approved by the Quality and Standards Committee (QSC), covering all academic provision within the scope of this code.
  2. The DES schedule **must** interact positively with any accreditation and/or reaccreditation process as required by the subject area’s PSRB, which may lead to the DES being postponed to the following academic year.
  3. **No later than** the beginning of each academic year the Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision will write to the Head of Subject Area (HoSA) and Dean of Faculty for each subject area scheduled to be reviewed in that year confirming that the review will take place and inviting the HoSA to identify preferred dates for conducting the review. In addition to taking account of the various stages of the process (as noted in section 5 above) the choice of date **must** be one which enables a sufficiently representative number of current students to meet with the Review Panel during the review day. This notification will also invite the HoSA to nominate potential external members of the review panel.

# Membership of the Review Panel

* 1. Review Panels **must** include the following:

1. A member of one of the sub-committees of the University Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC).
2. No fewer than two members of academic staff from cognate disciplines (but not from any subject area responsible for the provision being reviewed).
3. Two members external to the University.
4. A University Quality Manager (Secretary).
5. A member of the Teaching Excellence Academy (TEA).
6. A student member (who **must** not be studying, or have studied, in the subject area responsible for the provision being reviewed).
   1. The Chair of the Panel, in consultation with the HoSA **should** consider the desirability of including a member(s) from Professional Support Services experienced in the provision of learning resources relevant to the discipline or a member of academic staff from a different faculty.
   2. Membership of the Review Panel **should** be established as follows:
7. The Chair of the Panel will be appointed by the Chair of QSC after consultation with the Quality Support Service.
8. The academic staff will be nominated by the Dean (or nominee) in consultation with the Quality Support Service.
9. The Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision is responsible for nominating a member of Quality Support Service as the Secretary to the Review Panel.
10. The student member will be nominated by the President (Education), Hull University Student Union (HUSU), in consultation with the Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision. The student member **must** be either a member of the HUSU Sabbatical team, a recent graduate (within the last three years) of the University or a current student (who **must** not be studying, or have studied, in the subject area responsible for the provision being reviewed).
    1. The two external members **must** be appointed as follows:
11. The HoSA will be asked to nominate no fewer than two potential external members, one of whom **must** be an academic experienced in the discipline in question, who has such levels of expertise and experience in the field represented by the subject area’s programmes that they can make a judgement of the ‘validity and relevance’ of the academic provision. The other **should** be a ‘stakeholder’ (for example somebody working in a sector which does or might recruit graduates from the programmes to be reviewed). Where, after consultation with the Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision and the Dean (or nominee), it appears inappropriate to nominate a ‘stakeholder’, the second external **must** be another academic.
12. External members **should** not be current or recent (within the last three years) external examiners of the University.
13. The HoSA **must** provide an indication of why they think each person would be an appropriate member of the Review Panel. The HoSA **should** informally approach the nominated externals to ask if they would be willing to be approached by the University.
14. The student member and external members will be paid a fee plus expenses, the cost of which will be met by QSS.
    1. The Secretary of the Review Panel is responsible for formally contacting each external and inviting them to become a member of the Review Panel.

# Preliminary meeting

* 1. The preliminary meeting will take place with the Subject Area and Quality Support Service.
  2. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure the following is agreed:

1. The date of the review, including whether the review will be conducted over one day or two.
2. The provision to be included in the review – this **should** be the entire provision within the ‘subject’ (undergraduate and taught postgraduate) unless there are compelling reasons for this not to be the case. If any provision is to be excluded consideration **must** be given to how and when this will be reviewed and is subject to the approval of the Chair of QSC.
3. Any specific organisational/logistical issues.
4. Identification of a suitable venue for the review to be held.
5. Confirmation of the documentation to be provided by the Subject Area and QSS.
6. Housekeeping - responsibilities and schedule.
   1. The Chair of QSC is the final arbiter of any unresolved issues.
   2. Where the Subject Area is also applying for professional or other external accreditation, or is scheduled to be externally reviewed (e.g. by OfS or Ofsted), the preliminary meeting **should** include discussion of the impact of such a process on the review and vice versa and consider the extent to which the review process might be modified to minimise the burden on the Subject Area without compromising the rigour of the DES process. Any proposals to modify the process **must** be approved by the Chair of QSC.

# Involvement of Students

* 1. The Quality and Standards Committee, in consultation with the HUSU President (Education), will provide guidance to Subject Areas on recommended ways to involve students in the process of DES covering the period from preparation for review to completion of the final action plan. Guidance will cover:

1. Inviting students to meet the Review Panel and briefing them about the process.
2. Informing them of the outcomes of the review.
3. Involving them in the development and subsequent monitoring of the action plan.

# Self-Evaluation Template (SET)

* 1. The SET **must** be completed in accordance with the approved template – see Annex 1. The purpose of the SET is to present the Subject Area’s reflection of the way in which the provider assures and enhances the quality of the learning opportunities provided and maintains academic standards. The SET also requires evaluation of the way the provider ensures the accuracy of information about the provider’s programmes. The SET **should** build on existing processes of evaluation within the Subject Area, especially student feedback, continuous monitoring, evaluation and enhancement of programmes (CMEE), Curriculum Review and Development Reports for Apprenticeships, consideration of external examiner reports, and any other review.
  2. The Review Panel will use the SET to assess how the provision reflects external reference points (such as the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), QAA UK Quality Code (including Subject Benchmark Statements), Office for Students, and University regulations and codes of practice and how this reflection impacts on the student learning experience and the maintenance of academic standards.
  3. The template seeks to encourage evaluation of both strengths/areas of good practice and areas for development and is based on a link between each of the main headings:

1. The context of the Subject Area – status and development of provision.
2. Self-Evaluation (including reference to the previous review where applicable).
3. Curricula and Assessment – how this supports the achievement of the intended programme competencies; how the SA ensures the continued ‘validity and relevance’ of the curricula, and how it communicates the curricula to students.
4. Programme Competencies – how these demonstrate the coherency of the programme.
5. Quality of learning opportunities:
   1. Learning and teaching.
   2. Student admission, progression and achievement – including analysis of data.
   3. Learning resources (human and material).
6. Maintenance of academic standards.
7. Assurance and enhancement of quality.
8. Accuracy and completeness of published information.
   1. At appropriate points of the SET reference **should** be made to any specific differences in the management of the provision for example relating to postgraduate taught or apprenticeship provision, study abroad and/or work placements forming part of the provision, including evaluating the mechanisms for securing such opportunities and for assuring the quality of the learning opportunities provided.
   2. The Dean (or nominee) **should** determine the extent to which they wish the faculty to be involved in supporting the writing of the SET and in signing it off before submission to the Secretary.

# Supporting documentation

* 1. The Subject Area is only requested to complete the SET.
  2. The Quality Support Service (with support from the Quality Team for the faculty) will gather supporting documentation on behalf of the Subject Area. This supporting documentation will form an evidence base for the Review Panel to evaluate alongside the SET. The evidence base will include (for example):

1. A sample of programme specifications.
2. Access to Canvas for programme information.
3. External Examiner reports (including responses).
4. Exam board information.
5. Academic Misconduct data.
6. Data indicators aligned with the B3 OfS conditions of registration.
7. Requests for Extensions and Additional Consideration data.
8. Admission information.
9. Induction processes.
10. Relevant Programme Journal(s) (CMEE) and Curriculum Review and Development Reports for Apprenticeship provision.
11. Student Staff Forum minutes.
12. Student Survey information (MEQ/HSS/NSS).
    1. **Note:** If supporting documentation is unavailable there may be a need for a follow up meeting (post the Review Day) to provide confidence in the assurance of quality and standards.

# Briefing meeting

* 1. The briefing meeting **must** be held no fewer than two weeks before the review. This **may** be conducted via Teams for ease of external panel members.
  2. The purpose of the meeting is to enable the panel to meet each other, discuss the process of the review, and to identify areas of focus for each panel member (from the SET and supporting documentation).
  3. Following the briefing meeting, panel members will be invited to complete the SET Assurance Template (Annex 2) in order to identify good practice, issues, omissions and provide lines of enquiry for the review day itself. The Assurance Template is a working document for panel members to consider the key themes of the SET (as noted above in 10.3) and to find ‘confidence’ in each of the key themes.

# The Review Day

## Meetings with staff

* 1. The review day will involve either a full day or concurrent half days and **should** include meetings with:

1. The Head of Subject Area and ‘key players’ (such as staff with specific responsibilities for quality, learning and teaching and student progress).
2. A sample of teaching staff (a mix of staff recently appointed and longer serving staff).
   1. Any overlap between staff of the two meetings above **should** be avoided.
   2. A follow-up meeting with the head and key players will normally be held to address any outstanding issues or issues arising from the meetings with teaching staff and students/apprentices.

## Meetings with students

* 1. The Review Panel **must** meet with a representative sample of the Subject Area’s students.
  2. The Subject Area **should** provide a list of students expected to attend the meeting and their designation (level, year, mode).
  3. The QSS will provide students with information explaining the purpose and process of DES, including providing access to online training/development.

## Panel meeting

* 1. The review day will include private meetings of the panel, and the Chair will provide oral feedback to the Head of Subject Area and other nominated staff at the end of the day. The feedback will provide an indicative list of strengths/areas of good practice and recommendations but does not preclude other issues being included in the report.

## Format of review meetings

* 1. The precise format for the day will be agreed between the panel and the Head of Subject Area but will normally be based around the following model:

1. Private meeting of the panel (45-60 minutes)
2. Meeting with HoSA/key players in the subject (60-75 minutes)
3. Meeting with a sample of teaching staff (60 minutes)
4. Panel lunch (20-30 minutes)
5. Meeting with students (60-75 minutes)
6. Private meeting of the panel (30-45 minutes)
7. Follow-up meeting with staff (45-60 minutes)
8. Private meeting of the panel (45-60 minutes)
9. Oral feedback (15 minutes).
   1. There may be circumstances in which a Dean or Head of Subject Area is able to provide a panel with information additional to that held in the subject. In such circumstances the panel or the Dean/Head of Subject Area can request that an additional information sharing meeting be scheduled.

# Summary of initial feedback

* 1. Within three working days of the review day, the Secretary **should** provide the Head of Subject with a short note confirming the Review Panel’s initial feedback. This note will be agreed with the Chair of the Review Panel.

# Developmental Engagement with Subject Reports

* 1. Each review will result in a report which will be drafted by the Secretary and be agreed by the Review Panel. The Secretary will make a record of each of the meetings and discussions of the panel as the basis for drafting the report and be guided by the panel’s summary of strengths/areas of good practice and recommendations agreed during the day and provided as feedback to the Subject Area at the end of the day.

## Report schedule

* 1. The report will be completed according to the schedule set out below ensuring that the draft report is made available to the Subject Area no more than eight weeks after the review day and the final report is submitted to the Quality and Standards Committee.
  2. The schedule for production of the report is as follows:

Developmental Engagement review day +

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Draft version 0 01 produced by Secretary | 1 week for checking within QSS |
| Draft version 0 02 circulated to Review Panel | Review Panel given 2 weeks to comment |
| Draft version 1 00 sent to Subject Area and Faculty for comment on factual accuracy | Subject Area given two weeks to make comments |
| Draft version 1 01 | 2 weeks for final checking, approval by Review Panel Chair |
| Final report – version 2 00 sent to Secretary of QSC for next QSC meeting |  |

## Format of the report

* 1. The report will be constructed around the SET and will reflect the areas of enquiry which will have been used by the panel to stimulate discussion in each of the sessions. The evidence (whether fact or opinion) gained during the sessions with staff and students/apprentices will be drawn together, coupled with the views of the panel (whether forming the basis for recommendations or not), and drawing on the supporting documentation where appropriate.
  2. The first section of the report will contain examples of strengths and good practice noted in the review, and, where appropriate, recommendations to QSC or other bodies within the University. Each recommendation will reference the paragraph in the body of the report to which it refers. The recommendations in the report will be incorporated as action points in the DES action plan and approved as part of the report.
  3. The whole of the Review Panel is responsible for the content of the report, including ensuring that the findings (strengths and recommendations) are founded on appropriate evidence (including discussion during the review day). The Chair of the Panel is the final arbiter in the event of any disagreement.

## Distribution of the report

* 1. The Subject Area reviewed, and the relevant faculty, will receive draft version 1 of the report for comment on the **factual accuracy** of the report. This is not an opportunity to query the findings of the report. The Chair of the Review Panel will be the final arbiter of whether changes **should** be made to the report based on the Subject Area’s comments.

## Approval and analysis

* 1. The Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) will receive for discussion and approval the final version of each report. The Committee will address any recommendations made to it, and decide appropriate action to take, and will satisfy itself that the review has been conducted appropriately and in accordance with this code of practice.
  2. At the end of each academic session the Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision will provide QSC with a summary of good practice, issues and recommendations from each of the reports to facilitate identification by the Committee of recurrent themes, as the basis for staff development, dissemination of good practice, enhancement of quality systems and other activity.

# Action plan

* 1. The Subject Area, in consultation with the faculty, **must** produce for approval by QSC at the same time as approval of the report, the action plan setting out how, and by when, it will address each of the recommendations set out in the report. The report will use the action plan template in Annex 3. Progress against this plan **must** be monitored by the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) and where programmes have an apprenticeship variant, actions **must** be communicated to University Apprenticeship Quality and Compliance Committee to ensure any risks that impact on the apprenticeship can be actioned and monitored. The faculty is responsible for ensuring that all actions are completed within the timescale set out in the plan and **must** report on progress, including any actions not completed, in its CMEE Journal.

# Feedback to students/apprentices

* 1. Following receipt of the final version of the report the HoSA **must** make appropriate arrangements, in consultation with the faculty, for providing feedback to students on the outcomes of the review. This **must** at least include making students aware of the location of the review report and action plan.
  2. Feedback **should** include discussion of the outcomes of the review with student staff forum(s)
  3. The QSS is responsible for providing students with a summary of the outcomes of the review.
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