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**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**Department of Chemical Engineering**

Date of Meeting: 8th February 2011

Present: Jane Horner (ADT), Caroline Smith (Teaching Centre), Chris Rielly (HOD), Steve Tarleton, Zoltan Nagy, Janey Briers

**1. Programmes Reviewed**

MEng Chemical Engineering (MEng CE)

BEng Chemical Engineering (BEng CE)

MEng Chemical Engineering with Management (CEM)

BEng Chemical Engineering with Environmental Protection (CEEP)

MSc Advanced Chemical Engineering with IT and Management (ACE)

MSc Advanced Process Engineering (APE)

MSc Pharmaceutical Engineering (PE)

**2. Actions Since the Last APR Meeting**

The following actions were noted in the previous APR report

* Issue of PGT offers being delayed due to late decisions on the English language requirement. Action was to refer the issue to Student Recruitment Team and this has been resolved. However the Department considers that offers to international students are being delayed due to the time taken by the University to decide the fees for the next session. A similar issue occurs with the fee structure for the DIS year for international undergraduate students.

**ACTION:** ADT to raise fees information issue with Student Recruitment Team

* Measures to be put in place to ensure that all coursework feedback uses a proforma *.* Each piece of coursework now has a proforma
* Refer to PQT dept concerns about no opportunity to provide a response to student appeals. This was in relation to appeals about termination of studies. The department would like to about to comment on these in a similar manner to other types of student appeal.
* **ACTION**: ADT to raise with Programme Quality Team
* Refer to PQT dept concerns about amount of supervision that should be given to PGT resiting dissertation without tuition. This is currently being discussed by PQT
* Review ILOs of projects with Faculty QEO*.* This action has been completed

**3. Actions Since the NSS**

The APR submission contains a detailed discussion of the NSS data. Department was ranked third nationally. Concern that the very high response rate from students had contributed to a drop in scores.

The AD(T) met with the Department in October 2010 to discuss the 2010 NSS data. The following actions were agreed

* Teaching Coordinator to review whether it would be useful for some staff to receive support from Faculty QEO regarding assessment criteria. The Department wants to review the feedback on the Semester One modules and then suggests that certain staff contact the QEO.

**ACTION**: Review feedback and then discuss with QEO

* Continue to monitor returned coursework in terms of both quality of feedback and timeliness of return. This has been completed for Semester One. Four sets of coursework were returned to staff for the feedback to be improved. Staff are reminded when both UG and PGT deadlines are approaching

**ACTION**: Review coursework return log to see when staff are actually returning coursework.

**4. Report on Programme Data**

4.1 Undergraduate

**Admissions**

* MEng & BEng CE- significant fall in MEng home applications from 09 to 10 entry and slight fall in BEng applications. Subsequent fall in intake numbers for MEng but increased BEng intake. Department expects many BEng students to transfer to MEng during the programme. Total intake on CE was 71 students in October 10 compared with 81 students in October 09. Intake quality was excellent for both MEng and BEng. Increased international applications over last two years for MEng
* Department is held as CI for students applying to Cambridge and Imperial
* 2009 entry applications followed a similar pattern to 2007 entry. The 2010 entry is following the same trend as the 2008 entry.
* CEM and CEEP- More international than home applicants for 10 entry. Small number of applicants and hence small intake on both programmes. This is the last intake year for CEEP. There are no additional costs involved in running CEM so Department will continue to offer that programme. Quality of intake is excellent on both programmes.

**Progression**

* Very few withdrawals from programmes and the two that did withdraw were internal transfers to Chemistry
* MEng and BEng CE- Excellent progression in June in all Parts
* CEM and CEEP- Small cohort so difficult to draw conclusions from data

**Attainment**

* MEng CE – excellent attainment. Only two students out of 26 did not obtain 1st or 2.1
* BEng CE- also excellent attainment with a significant number of 1st/2.1s for a BEng programme. The department puts this partially down to having distinctly different programmes and assessments for MEng and BEng students.

4.2 Postgraduate

**Admissions**

* ACE- Fall in intake between 09 entry (17 students) and 10 entry (9 students). Modules are shared with other programmes, so there are no issues about viability with small numbers.
* APE- Similar recruitment pattern to previous years, with intake of 18 students in October 10
* PE – very small intake, only three students each year for the last three years. This programme will not recruit from 11/12 onwards.

**Attainment**

Attainment of awards is excellent with distinctions being awarded. No withdrawal of students

**5. Issues Raised by Student Feedback on Modules**

5.1 Undergraduate

Majority of modules were well above 3.0 with most lecturers scoring above 4.0. Modules scoring below 3.0 were

* Part A Fluid Mechanics – Issue with a member of staff who only took tutorials not being contactable regarding the team based exercise. Has been asked to be more available to students. Teaching of this module is under review as students find it challenging.
* Part A Heat Transfer – Issue with lecture delivery being “uninspiring”. New member of staff will teach this in 11/12
* Part B Chemical Engineering Design – Issue with how one lecturer integrates their material with the module ethos. The module content is under review and likely to be modified to accommodate more Fluid Mechanics teaching in Part B.

5.2 Postgraduate

All scores in MSc modules were above 3.0 with the majority above 4.0. In response to previous student comments most modules are now block taught over two weeks not one. Issues with software resources in CGP052 (resolved to Dept satisfaction) and require more problem- solving time in CGP60

**6. Issues Raised by Staff Student Committees**

Responses from module feedback was tabled at the meeting along with actions to resolve issues

6.1 Undergraduate

* Cross campus travel has been an issue for several years. No improvement this academic year. Department noted that staff in Room Bookings were very helpful in trying to resolve the problem.
* Allocation of dissertation choices. This was the result of a misunderstanding by a student. System has now been fully explained to students.
* Return of feedback on coursework mentioned often in minutes

6.2 Postgraduate

No major issues

**7. Issues Raised by External Examiners**

7.1 Undergraduate

* Raised the issue that quality of feedback from staff is not consistent. Department agrees with this and has taken many actions in an attempt to resolve the problem.
* Students need to get a feel for industrial applications. This comment arose from discussions with students. The department does already have a strong industrial focus in its teaching and it would be difficult to know how to enhance it further

**ACTION:** Department to emphasise industrial applications to students to make them aware of the existing industrial focus of programmes.

* Questioned the need for students to obtain credit in a certain number of modules rather than meet an overall pass mark. EE was unhappy with the concept of condonement, rather than the rigour of the process applied by the department

7.2 Postgraduate

Changes have been made to the structure and assessment of projects following comments from EE in 2008/09. EE comments very positively on the changes in the 09/10 report.

**8. Issues Raised by Professional Accreditation Bodies**

No accreditation visits in 09/10

**9. Discussions on Institutional Issues**

9.1 Attendance Monitoring

APR submissions contained a detailed description of how attendance is monitored for all students in the department. Submissions also contained example of records kept by the department

9.2 Contact Hours

Department has a high number of contact hours, There are few gaps on the timetable.

9.3 Prompt Return of Assessment and Related Feedback

Department has introduced a coursework turnaround time limit of 6 weeks (which includes holiday periods) and is monitoring staff compliance with this.

Generic Exam Feedback

Summary of current situation

Department complies with the University policy and furthermore, expects generic feedback on ***all***exams to be posted on Learn. Staff are reminded of this obligation via contact with the Director of UG Studies who periodically checks for the presence of exam feedback. Additionally, some staff provide worked examples/model exam answers via Learn and/or support in revision classes in week 12.

QEO recommendations

* QEO to sample a selection of generic exam feedback and review the quality of feedback offered.

9.4 Assessment Balance and Load

Changes to assessment of other modules

Director of UG Studies continues to encourage all staff to provide explicit assessment criteria for each assignment in addition to using the Department wide generic grade descriptors which have been produced.

9.5 Assessment Criteria for Projects

Changes to “U/G projects/dissertations” assessment since last APR

Director of UG Studies has reviewed UG project module specifications in the light of QEO comments and made appropriate changes to intended learning outcomes and general layout. Considerable work has also been undertaken to improve the guidance given to students (instructions and exemplars provide clear direction).

QEO recommendations

* Responsible Examiner for PG project modules to be contacted directly and offered QEO support in reviewing module as part of the annual update

**10. Other**

10.1 Student Charter

In principle the Department supports the concept of a charter. The management of student expectations is a concern. Department would want students to be given clear information about what they can and can not expect from departments,

10.2 Percentage Part Contribution to Degree Classification

Department is not opposed to a uniform percentage part contribution provided Exam Boards had discretion to move degree boundaries. Department has no objection to a proposal for Part A to contribute a small percentage to the final degree classification.

10.3 Induction & Support for Returners

Changes since last APR

Department provides a coherent “package” of information for returning students including a talk from the Director of Studies with supporting material posted on Learn. Sessions include an update on any changes, provision of important information, reminder of student obligations and an opportunity to speak to a senior member of staff.

Other enhancements this year include splitting the induction session for Part A students into 2 parts to avoid information overload (a welcome session followed a few days later by an information session).

QEO recommendations

*None arising*

10.4 Quality of Lecture Rooms

Staff raised concerns about the quality of some rooms, especially EHB. Staff also had problems with AV equipment not working or no instructions being available in lecture rooms. Also issues with poor ventilation in pool rooms.

10.5 LUSI Progression Data

Concerns over how student transfers from MEng to BEng are recorded in the case when a student has failed to proceed on MEng but can transfer to BEng.

10.6 Admissions Data Supplied for APR

Incorrect data supplied to dept.

**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**Department of Civil and Building Engineering**

Date of Meeting: 25th January 2011

Present: Jane Horner (ADT), Caroline Smith (Teaching Centre), Tony Thorpe (HOD), Margaret Missett, Graham Sander (Teaching Coordinator), Paul Fleming, David Pitfield , Geoff Hodgson, Richard Fellows, Julian Mackenzie, Jacqui Glass, Pat Carrillo, Mahroo Eftekhari, Malcolm Cook, Abigail Bristow**,** Mike Smith, Brian Skinner, Bob Reed, Andrew Price

**1. Programmes Reviewed**

UG

CVUB01 BEng Civil Engineering (Civil)

CVUM01 MEng Civil Engineering (Civil)

CVUB10 BSc Air Transport Management (ATM)

CVUB15 BSc Transport & Business Management (TBM)

CVUB18 BSc Commercial Management & Quantity Surveying (CMQS)

CVUB19 BSc Construction Engineering Management (CEM)

CVUB20 BSc Architectural Engineering & Design Management (AEDM)

PG

CVPT30/29 MSc Construction Project Management (CPM)

CVPT31/40 MSc Construction Management (CM)

CVPT39/45 MSc Building Services Engineering (BS)

CVPT43/44 MSc Low Carbon Building Design & Modelling (LCBDM)

CVPT32/42 MSc Transport Policy & Business Management (TPBM)

CVPT35/25 MSc Sustainable Transport & Travel Planning (STTP)

WEDC

CVPT70 MSc Water & Waste Engineering (WWE)

CVPT71 MSc Water & Environmental Management (WEM)

CVPT81 MSc Water & Environmental Management (mixed/DL) (WEMmdl)

CVPT78 MSc Water & Environmental Management (DL) (WEMdl)

CVPT77 MSc Water & Waste Engineering (DL) (WWEdl)

CVPT81 MSc Water & Environmental Management (taught/DL) (WEMtdl)

CVPT80 Infrastructure in Emergencies (DL) (IEdl)

**2. Actions Since the Last APR Meeting**

Department included a detailed formal response to the 2010 APR report which noted both responses to agreed actions and commented on progress on other items in the report. Main points to note

* Future of MSc Construction Project Management (Work Based DL), which is taught jointly with Herriot-Watt is currently under review as Herriot-Watt is withdrawing from the programme. Department has taken steps to ensure that that no LU based student will be disadvantaged by this.
* Progression rates of Part B Civil in June 10 were still low but overall progression was satisfactory (see 4.1)
* Student Support Office opened in January 2010 and is a “one stop shop” for students. Positive comments have been received from students about the support received
* University policy on providing handouts was discussed at PQT in June 2010. PQT recommended that module leaders make clear to students what material would be supplied at the start of a module. Department has a policy of providing copies of handouts and this issue has not been raised by students recently.
* Amount of bought in teaching on transport programmes has been reduced which has reduced complaints from students
* The Transport Group has reviewed the marking of final year project reports to ensure that the whole marking range is used. In 09/10 the top project received a mark of 83%. Staff are reminded of the marking guidelines each year (see 4.1 & 7.2)
* All external Examiners are invited for an interim visit before the Exam Board
* The use of multiple-choice questions (MCQ) for exams on the CMQS programme has been reviewed. One Part A module still has an exam wholly assessed by MCQ (see 7.1).
* Fees have been reduced on the MSc in Building Services to bring it more in line with competitor programmes. Issue over funding of agents fees from dept non-pay budget still a concern
* Response to QEOs report is on-going. Caroline Smith offered to assist the Department with this

**ACTION**: Dept to consider working with Faculty QEO

**3. Actions Since the NSS**

Department provided a commentary on their performance in the NSS relative to other universities. As in previous years the department ranked highly nationally for student satisfaction.

At the NSS meeting with the AD(T), held in October 2010, the Teaching Coordinator was asked to discuss the effect of staff changes on students on the CMQS programme with the Head of Department. From the NSS programme data, students on the CMQS programme were noticeably less positive about their programme than other students in the department. At the NSS meeting it was discussed that this was due to staff changes during the academic year (see 6.1). The Head of Department is fully aware of the issues and has already recruited another staff member in this area. Many of the concerns raised by students in 09/10 were regarding supervision of their final year projects. These concerns have been addressed for 10/11.

**4. Report on Programme Data**

4.1 Undergraduate

**Admissions**

Generally strong performance on admissions with increased application numbers and good entry grades. Points to note

* Increase in BEng Civil numbers and decrease in MEng Civil numbers for October 10 entry. However combined intake same as previous years. Department would prefer a greater proportion of MEng at intake but as students can transfer from BEng to MEng do not consider it an issue
* Increase in number of A-level intake on ATM for October 2010 entry
* Significant increase in international application to TBM in 09/10 but no significant increase in international intake
* Drop in A level intake to CMQS for October 2010 compared to previous years. Department conceded to some students who had already obtained sponsorship.
* Increase on intake numbers on AEDM over last two years. This programme has seen a steady increase in applications of the years

**Progression**

Progression between parts is generally good, especially AEDM, with following exceptions

* Progression rates in June (58% in 2010) for Part B BEng Civil are still a concern. The number of termination of studies in June 10 for Part B of this programme was discussed and the Dept considered that this was unusual and not a trend
* Part A ATM and Part A TBM have low progression rates in June 10. This was also noted in 2008
* CMQS- Part B progression in June 10 was 67%

**ACTION**: Continue to monitor progression rates for programmes in June, especially for Part B BEng Civil and Part B CMQS

**Attainment**

Good spread of degree results on most programmes. Points to note

* Significant number of 1st awarded on MEng Civil. Fully supported by the external examiner in their report
* Mostly 2.2s awarded on TBM which is surprising considering the small cohort.

**ACTION**: Analysis the effect of final year project mark on degree classification for TBM, in light of External Examiners comments on project marking

4.2 Postgraduate

**Admissions**

Recruitment is good on most programmes. The new programmes introduced over the last few years have recruited well and this has allowed the department to reduce numbers on CM. Points to note

* CM- The international intake has reduced due to problems with prospective students obtaining visas.
* WEDEC – Has two start dates in the year that meant it was able to recruit students who could not obtain a visa for October start.
* WEDEC programmes recruited very well in 09/10.
* Transport MScs are recruiting small number of students. Consideration should be given to opening up the modules on these programmes to other degrees to ensure programmes remain viable

**ACTION**: Investigate offering Transport PGT modules to more students, especially Part D MEng.

**Attainment**

Distinctions awarded on all programmes. Attainment of awards is excellent

**5. Issues Raised by Student Feedback on Modules**

5.1 Undergraduate

* Module feedback dealt with in detail in the Civil and CEM programmes with a full annotated response submitted for APR
* Civil - More contact has been established with the Maths Dept to resolve issues over Maths modules, with the department now providing suitable subject specific examples
* Civil – Significant number of responses below 3.0 for CVD003 Teamwork Design Management and CVD012 Project Information Management*.* It was considered that the scores related to CVD003 were not typical, as this module had run very successfully with the same staff member over many years. It was felt that the comments came from only one of the student groups on the module. From 10/11 onwards CVD012 will revert to an optional module.
* Transport – concern that the syllabus for CVB059 Business Strategy was not being followed. This was related to a bought-in teacher and has been resolved for 10/11
* Transport – no formal review module feedback at Staff Student Committee meetings. This will now take place in meetings

**ACTION:** Ensure that student feedback is discussed and that the discussion is recorded in the meeting minutes

* CMQS- CVB020- possible mismatch between staff and student expectations over background reading. This module was taught by a new member of staff in 09/10 and they have taken note of the comments.
* CEM- issues with lecturer leaving midway through the teaching of module CVA026. Department took measures to ensure that no student was adversely effected by this. All the students successfully passed the module

5.2 Postgraduate

All programmes provided detailed records of how module feedback was dealt with regarding discussions with students and resolution of issues. Points to note

* WEDEC- use of Wednesday afternoon to teach. Also some lectures over running.
* Con Man- Concerns raised about use of peer assessment. These have been resolved by the Programme director

**6. Issues Raised by Staff Student Committees**

6.1 Undergraduate

* Minutes of SSC for Civil, CMQS, CEM and ADEM clearly show that issues have been resolved regarding comments on modules
* Transport students were being taught on Wednesday afternoon. This was relation to collecting data on traffic movements, The module has been revised for 10/11 and this will not occur again

**ACTION**- HOD to ensure that staff are made aware of what activities they may and may not ask students to undertake on Wednesday afternoon

* ATM concerned about amount of aviation in programme. This was raised by Part B students who have not been exposed to the aviation content in Part C. Students in Part C consider that the programme has the correct balance
* Transport- many minor complaints e.g lecture rooms. These minor complaints should have been resolved quickly outside of SSC

**ACTION**: Transport staff to introduce a process for dealing swiftly with minor complaints from students

* CMQS – concerns about placements
* CMQS- concern over three hour periods with one staff member. This has been resolved for 10/11
* CMQS- concerns about effect of staff leaving/illness and effect on project work. Resolved for 10/11 (see 3.0)

6.2 Postgraduate

* Attendance is an issue on some programmes. Staff do remind students that they must attend.
* CM- Programme is no longer block taught. Change was made in response to comments from students.
* Con Man- students coming to lectures late
* BS- Students concerned about low marks for coursework. Staff reminded students to seek advice about coursework requirements.

**7. Issues Raised by External Examiners**

7.1 Undergraduate

* Concern about weak project from some MEng Civil students with student doing wholly descriptive projects
* Concern about use of MCQ papers in CMQS. This has been reduced to one exam in 10/11

7.2 Postgraduate

* CM & CPM- Only major issue related to the use of block taught modules. This has been resolved at the programme will not longer be block taught.
* Transport & WEDEC – Issue of greater guidance for staff on dissertation marking to ensure the full marks range is used

**ACTION**: Develop guidelines for staff for these programmes

**8. Issues Raised by Professional Accreditation Bodies**

Reaccreditation by CIOB for CEM and AEDM in 2010. Very positive report with no conditions attached to accreditation status.

**9. Discussions on Institutional Issues**

9.1 Attendance Monitoring

Department supplied examples of attendance monitoring records and listed which activities were used as part of the monitoring process. Attendance rates for 32 UG modules and 10 PG modules were also supplied. Attendances were generally good, but some modules were very low. CVB011 had the lowest attendance at 40% and then CVB008 and CVC037 at both 53%. Both CVB011 and CVB008 are taught to Part B Civil.

**ACTION:** Analysis attendance and progression data for Part B Civil to establish if there is a link

9.2 Contact Hours

The Department has a policy on the notional contact hours per credit per module. The engineering programmes have the most contact hours due to lab work and design modules. Rather than reduce contact hours for students the department would consider reducing the number of optional modules. There is a concern over increased staff student ratios and the effect on teaching.

9.3 Prompt Return of Assessment and Related Feedback

Department has a policy on the return of coursework to students but this is not monitored. Staff are reminded of the importance of good feedback. WEDEC give detailed written feedback to their DL students as this is the only contact with the staff.

Department has a small number of modules (11) which are 100% examination. At the time of writing, only 3 of these modules appear to have generic exam feedback on Learn.

QEO recommendations

* QEO to contact relevant Responsible Examiners and offer some support in the construction of generic exam feedback.
* Directors of Studies to consider how best to monitor availability of generic exam feedback eg use of the Departmental Information page rather than individual module pages may be beneficial.

9.4 Assessment Balance and Load

This has been recently reviewed in preparation for the JBM visit on 9th February 2011. Consideration is being given to moving to long-thin modules to reduce assessment load.

9.5 Assessment Criteria for Projects

Director of UG Studies recognises the potential to critically review module specifications – particularly timely ahead of the annual update in March (noted in pre APR meeting and written report within APR paperwork). However, since last APR, no apparent changes have been made to module specifications although it was clear on 25.01.11 that the issue of assessment of projects was/is being discussed amongst staff.

Changes to assessment of other modules

No other changes to assessment criteria within other modules apparent (discussed at pre APR meeting).

QEO recommendations

* Responsible Examiners for UG project modules to be contacted directly and offered QEO involvement in reviewing module specifications.
* Directors of Studies to ensure staff are aware of support available from QEO (generally and specifically when reviewing module specifications)

**10. Other**

10.1 Student Charter

Discussed the background to the charter. Department wants the charter to reflect staff expectations of students. It would like explicit statements of both student and staff responsibilities. Also suggested it be named a “Learning Charter” to reflect that there are expectations on both students and staff. Department Teaching Committee would be happy to discuss the charter with Maurice Fitzgerald

**ACTION:** Caroline Smith to inform Maurice Fitzgerald of offer to meet with Programme Directors

10.2 Percentage Part Contribution to Degree Classification

Department would like to keep its current percentage part contributions and would expect some variation across the university. Part D of the MEng has a higher percentage contribution than Part C to reflect the emphasis on the level 7 modules in Part D. External Examiners have not raised any issues regarding the percentage contributions of parts to the final award for the degrees in the department

10.3 Induction & Support for Returners

Most Part B and Part C Year Tutors meet with the student group in Week 1. Department will consider asking all Year Tutors to do this

**ACTION:** Ask those Year Tutors who are currently not arranging meetings with returning students to do so

Department is already linked to Registry “Returners’” page <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/returners/> and has planned induction events for returning students within some programmes eg Civil Engineering students receive talk from Programme Director and their engagement indirectly monitored through attendance records for labs. Architectural Design Engineering Management student cohort is also seen by Programme Director on return. Construction Management and Quantity Surveying students seen by Year Tutor on return and messages about modules/workloads reiterated (Parts B and C).

QEO recommendations

* May be useful for other programmes to consider how students are updated on any changes/provided with important information/reminded of their obligations/given an opportunity to speak to a senior member of staff.

10.4 Assessment Practice

Department has a standard feedback sheet. Some staff use their own feedback sheets.

**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**

Date of Meeting: 11th February 2011

Present: Jane Horner (ADT), Caroline Smith (Teaching Centre), Yiannis Vardaxoglou (HOD), Vince Dwyer, Richard Blanchard, James Flint, Keith Gregory, Julie Bouazza-Marouf, Brioni Hunt

**1. Programmes Reviewed**

MEng Electronic & Electrical Engineering (MEng EEE)

BEng Electronic & Electrical Engineering (BEng EEE)

MEng Electronic & Computer Systems Engineering (MEng ECSE)

BEng Electronic & Computer Systems Engineering (BEng ECSE)

MEng Systems Engineering (MEng SE)

BEng Systems Engineering (BEng SE)

MEng Electronic & Renewable Energy Systems Engineering (ERESE)

MEng Electronic & Software Engineering (ESE)

MSc Digital Communication Systems (DCS)

MSc Renewable Energy Systems Technology (REST)

MSc European Master in Renewable Energy (EMRE)

MSc Advanced Systems Engineering (ASE)

**2. Actions Since the Last APR Meeting**

Department provided a detailed response to the 2010 APR report. Main points to note

* Department was asked to monitor reasons for weak progression rates and student attendance. Progression is now being monitored and the department is meeting with students with poor engagement. However some module attendance in 10/11 in Part B and C modules is still between 50-60%. Student attendance has been discussed at staff meetings. Engagement of staff with personal tutees will be tightened up in Semester Two.

There is a strong correlation between the modules with the worst attendance and worst failure rate. Attendance is particularly bad at 9.00am sessions. The new style personal tutor system introduced for Part A in 10/11 appears to have improved Part A attendance. It is hoped that as the new system rolls out in to Part B in 11/12 that attendance will approve in Part B. This year letters have been sent to student whose attendance has dropped below 60%. The ADT suggested that the Part B Tutor should also meet with the students who have poor attendance. Introduction of mid module test may also improve engagement

**ACTION**: More formal engagement with students who are identified as potential failures

**ACTION**: Consider introduction of mid module tests that contribute to the module mark

* In the report of the last APR meeting it was noted that Part D students had concerns over block taught modules. Subsequently a student meeting was held with Part D and the students attending that meeting did not have any concerns over block taught modules. It was suggested that the comment arose from the fact that some staff running PGT modules forget that UG students are also attending and do not make material available to all students.
* Previous APR report raised concern over the length of exam questions in one module. The member of staff who set the questions has now retired.
* External Examiners want a meeting with students. Discussed inviting students to attend an informal meeting with External Examiners when they attend for Programme Boards.

**ACTION:** Invite Student group to meet External Examiners

**ACTION:** Invite External Examiners to the department for a day when the students are making presentations

**3. Actions Since the NSS**

APR submission contained a detailed discussion of NSS results. It was noted that the department’s response rate was well below the university average

Agreed actions at the NSS meeting with the ADT, held in October 2010 were as follows. The APR submission included a written response to the actions. Points to note

* HOD has contacted students groups to encourage take up of DIS. HOD will also meet with students to discuss NSS,

**ACTION:** Admin Staff will remind students to complete NSS

* Guidance to Systems Engineering students regarding choice of optional modules is now part of the Personal Tutor Session. Consideration is being given to simplifying module choices at Part C and D. A session will be held with Part B students to discuss options in Part C. Department recognises the need to control student expectations. Optional module selection will be carried out earlier in the academic year to ensure student have earlier confirmation of options.
* Timeliness of coursework return was discussed with Systems Eng students to establish which modules were late in returning marked work. Notes of the meeting were in the APR submission.
* At the NSS meeting, it was discussed that the department should monitor when staff return marked coursework to students. A process to do this will be put in place for 11/12

**ACTION:** In Semester Two 10/11, monitor return date of coursework that is returned via Admin staff

* Department does not want to introduce generic exam feedback for all modules at this stage. Preference is to concentrate of improving written feedback on coursework.

**ACTION**: Caroline Smith to send Vince Dwyer guidelines for generic exam feedback.

Discussed producing generic exam feedback for a limited number of modules in 10/11. HOD offered to take the lead in this.

**ACTION**: Yiannis Vardaxoglou to provide generic exam feedback for his module

* Consideration is being given to introducing drop-in session to enhance feedback on coursework. This will be targeted at Part C and D.

**4. Report on Programme Data**

4.1 Undergraduate

Department included an overall summation of UG data with the submission.

**Admissions**

* Home and international applications increased from 2008 to 2010 entry. However home applications have fallen for 2011 entry. This is the result of not making CCOs for Systems to applicants rejected by the Aero programme. The department needs to get students to apply directly for Systems rather than relay on making CCOs.

**ACTION**: Review marketing of System Eng.

* Applications for 2010 entry showed a shift from MEng to BEng
* Total intake has remained constant at approximately 125 over last three years. International student numbers have increased
* MEng intake quality is high
* Very small intakes on some programmes (ECSE). Department intends to remarket ECSE and increase the electronics content of the programme
* ERESE and ESE are now closed to new applicants.

**Progression**

* Minimal withdrawals
* Progression rates in June for Part B are still weak, especially BEng SE which was 38% in June. Part B SE students struggle with the modules on electronics. Students may benefit from a mid module progress test.

**ACTION**: Review modules offered to Part B SE to determine suitability

**Attainment**

* Attainment is good

4.2 Postgraduate

**Admissions**

* Admissions fell for DCS. Changes are being made to the programme content to improve recruitment.
* Fall in REST admissions over three year period. However current student numbers are what the department is comfortable teaching.
* Increase on EMRE numbers
* Minimal intake on ASE. A full time version of the programme will begin in October 2011.
* Department is considering offering more modules as short courses

**Attainment**

* Attainment is good with distinctions being awarded

**5. Issues Raised by Student Feedback on Modules**

APR submission contained a detailed description of the feedback process in the department. This included a critique of the feedback process. Department provided a detailed list of module feedback issues and proposed actions. Most issues were minor and easily resolved. An observation was made on how to provide suitable feedback on programming modules Ron Summers is looking into what other departments do to provide feedback on coding. Issue with availability of library books during PGT block taught modules. This is thought to relate to DCS. Module Leaders should contact the Library to discuss suitable e-books

**ACTION**: Contact Library to resolve issues with PGT modules

**6. Issues Raised by Staff Student Committees**

* Feedback on assessed work
* Cross campus travel. This has been reduced slightly in 10/11.
* Standard of Lecturer’s English. Following comments from students, department has undertaken informal teaching observations on some staff. Issues seem to be associated with block taught modules that are very intensive.

**ACTION**: Contact Jan Tennant to discuss options to resolve problem

**7. Issues Raised by External Examiners**

7.1 Undergraduate

* Exam questions appear to be repeatable. External Examiner wants more novel questions to test students. This has been resolved due to staff retirements
* Wants to meet students
* Calculation of project mark not transparent. Department replied that it is transparent to the module leader but not to the project supervisor.
* Penalties for late submission. Department recognises the need to be more consistent with the penalties applied to student work which is handed-in late. The AD(T) advised following the University Code of Practice

**ACTION**: Ensure all staff follow University Code of Practice.

* Movement of classification boundaries

7.2 Postgraduate

None

**8. Issues Raised by Professional Accreditation Bodies**

A joint visit from IET, RAeroS, EI and InstMC was held in March 2010. Issues raised by Panel were

* Feedback to students
* Guidance to students on module options
* Poor lecture attendance in Part B
* Require an individual element in the marking of group projects. At the APR meeting it was discussed that the department is reviewing assessment of group work

**ACTION:** Introduce Individual element

* IET requires students to pass their project at the first attempt
* Level of condonement to BEng students. This related to marks of 20% being condoned
* Differential pass marks for MEng and MSc taking the same module
* Lack of exams in Part D
* Low number of CEngs among staff.

**9. Discussions on Institutional Issues**

9.1 Attendance Monitoring

Submission contained a detailed summary of how attendance is monitored and included copies of attendance records. Some Part B and C modules had low attendance of between 50%-60%.

9.2 Contact Hours

Department has compared its contact hours with Imperial College and UCL and found them to be comparable. Students have a high number of contact hours.

9.3 Prompt Return of Assessment and Related Feedback

Discussed under section 3

9.4 Assessment Balance and Load

Since taking up post in September 2010, Director of UG Studies has met with QEO several times to discuss a variety of issues relating to assessment and feedback. At the time of writing, thought is being given to the most appropriate way of supporting staff with a review of module specifications/assessment criteria.

QEO recommendations

* Directors of UG and PG Studies to continue to seek support as required from QEO (including, if appropriate, specific sessions for staff).

Generic exam feedback

Summary of current situation

Department does have a few modules which are 100% examination and a number of modules with a high examination weighting. Whilst some staff do provide worked examples/exam question solutions etc, there is currently no Department wide approach to the provision of generic exam feedback.

QEO recommendations

* QEO to provide some examples of generic exam feedback for consideration.

9.5 Assessment Criteria for Projects

Changes to “U/G projects/dissertations” assessment since last APR

Changes have been made to the UG project module including a review of intended learning outcomes, assessment criteria and assessment tasks.

QEO recommendations

* Responsible Examiner for PG project module to be contacted directly and offered QEO support in reviewing module *ahead of next year’s APR*.

**10. Other**

10.1 Student Charter

Supportive of the Charter and wish it to state rights and responsibilities of both staff and students.

10.2 Percentage Part Contribution to Degree Classification

Suggested that all BEng and MEng programmes use the same weightings across the university.

10.3 Induction and Support for Returners

Changes since last APR

Department now offers planned “welcome back” talks for returning students given by HoD or nominee and “welcome back” letters from the Director of UG Studies in a bid to build an ongoing relationship with students. Department is also reviewing its Personal Tutoring system to provide further, ongoing support (particularly at UG level).

QEO recommendations

* Consider linking to the Registry “Returners” page <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/returners/> (currently undergoing some revisions)

**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**Department of Materials**

Date of Meeting: 7th February 2011

Present: Jane Horner (ADT), Caroline Smith (Teaching Centre), Jon Binner (HOD), Barry Haworth, Rebecca Higginson, Noreen Thomas, Houzheng Wu, Dawn Dawson, Anne Cullen

**1. Programmes Reviewed**

MEng Materials Engineering

BEng Materials Engineering

MEng Automotive Materials

BEng Automotive Materials

BSc Design with Engineering Materials (DEM)

BEng Materials with Management Studies

MSc Materials for Industry

MSc Packaging Technology (Materials for Industry)

MSc Polymer Technology

**2. Actions Since the Last APR Meeting**

The department provided a detailed formal response to the 2010 APR report. The following points were discussed

* The progress of students who were condoned at Exam Boards is being monitored. Department Policy is to condone very few students and not to condone any student who has had condonement applied at a previous Exam Board.
* Coursework hand-in dates have been revised in response to student comments on the bunching of hand-in dates. Admin Staff are reviewing module handouts to monitor the overall picture for hand-in dates
* Department has introduced a new Code of Practice for the marking of individual investigative projects to ensure staff use the full marks range.
* Amount of laboratory space available for undergraduate teaching has now doubled. This has greatly improved the timetabling of practical sessions. The department has also provided a new PC suite for student use.

**3. Actions Since the NSS**

The department provided a commentary on their performance in the NSS and in 2010 was ranked nationally first, joint with Imperial College. At the NSS meeting, held with the department in October 2010, feedback for the Part C module “Tomorrow’s Materials” was discussed. This module has now been restructured to make it more focused for students. Students will be made aware of changes introduced in response to NSS feedback at the briefing session of this year’s NSS. Staff not providing timely feedback on student work has been identified by the department as an issue to be resolved. In 2010/11 marked laboratory reports (on selected Part-B modules, following a pilot exercise on 09MPB103) will be returned to students earlier, which means some students will have the report returned before other students submit their report on the same laboratory. The laboratory rota has been arranged so all students have the same mix of “early” and “late” labs meaning no student will have an unfair advantage. Turn-It-In will also be used to check for plagiarism. The department is also monitoring staff marked coursework return dates.

**4. Report on Programme Data**

4.1 Undergraduate

**Admission**

Recruitment for programmes is challenging. The number of student applying nationally for degrees in materials is very small. A significant number of change course offers, either during the application period or in August, are made with change course offers accounting for the majority of the intake. The department had the third largest intake nationally for the subject in October 2010. Changes have been made to the department Open Days to make the events more dynamic. A video has been produced to inform students about materials engineering

Although the department received 35 applications for Mats Eng from international students, no international UG were recruited for October 2010 intake. Only two international UG were recruited in the last three academic years, all on Mats Eng. The department should investigate which offers the international applicants are accepting in preference to Loughborough.

**ACTION:** Analyse CF and CI choices for Mats Eng international applications

The long-term plan is to raise the quality of the intake, even if this means a modest decrease in numbers. This is line with also increasing the number of MEng students on programmes. Offer grades will be increased and the department wants to move to a position where it is held as the insurance offer for Oxbridge applicants. (Note – this will need close monitoring in light of possible changes to student behaviour as a result of the new fee structures).

**Progression**

Very few withdrawals from students, considering the number of change course offers made to meet recruitment targets. Coupled with the strong scores in the NSS indicates that students who accepted a change course offer are happy with their new programme.

Progressions rates in 09/10 were poor for Mats and DEM and not considered typical by staff. Students who failed to proceed were failing to achieve credit in many modules rather than failing in just one. Progression rates for Auto Mats were good and this may be linked to the higher intake quality of the cohort. Student attendance is monitored to encourage student performance.

**Attainment**

Student numbers are small on most programmes, but attainment is good with MEng students being awarded 1st class degrees. BEng Mats Eng had the largest graduating cohort with 30 students of which 23 were awarded 2ii classification.

4.2 Postgraduate

**Admission**

Half of the full-time intake joins the department via the LCMP route. This has been running for several years and the current plan is to maintain the relationship but not to increase student numbers. The department already has a good recruitment initiative with Singapore; a similar partnership with other universities in India is being explored.

**Attainment**

Distinctions awarded on all programmes. Attainment of awards is excellent. Student from the LCMP perform very well on the programme.

**5. Issues Raised by Student Feedback on Modules**

The APR submission contained a comprehensive list of issues raised by students and the subsequent action taken by the department. All issues have been dealt with in a timely fashion .The following issues were discussed at the meeting

5.1 Undergraduate

* MPA101- Students would like to physically produce the part designed using the CAD software. Staff are happy with this suggestion and will try to arrange for the manufacture
* MPB101- Issues were raised over the maths and thermodynamics content of the module. The relevant topics are covered in Part A and the department has taken measures to remind students of the topics

5.2 Postgraduate

* MPP140- Comments were made about the exam marks (Also see 7.2). The exam paper required students to demonstrate lateral thinking, which can be challenging to some students from different educational backgrounds. The format of the exam has been restructured for 10/11.

**6. Issues Raised by Staff Student Committees**

* Students were uncertain of the requirements for DIS. This has been resolved
* Timely return of marked coursework. The department is working on improving return times (see 3 Response to NSS)
* Auto Mats students considered that they were disadvantaged on modules taken with AAE students. Concerns were expressed about AAE staff expecting students to have knowledge of material taught in modules that are not taken by Auto Mats students. Staff in AAE have been contacted about this and the issue has been resolved
* Relative weighting of the assessment of project oral presentations. This has been increased for 10/11 but consideration has been given to removing this element of assessment from the module
* Bunching of coursework deadlines (see 2 Response to Previous APR)
* Use of on-line resources for Maths tutorials. Students would prefer a member of staff to explain the solution to problems. This issue has been passed to the Maths Dept.

**7. Issues Raised by External Examiners**

Following points, raised by External Examiners, were discussed at the APR meeting

7.1 Undergraduate

* Perceived lack of written feedback to students on project reports. The department does provide written formative feedback on interim reports, but this is not evident from the final version reviewed by the External Examiner

**ACTION**: Provide External Examiner with copies of all the feedback given to students

* EE noted that overall student performance dropped on modules with a significant analytical content. Staff were also concerned about this and were reviewing the format of exam papers

**ACTION:** Continue to monitor student performance in analytical modules. Consider introduction of formula sheets for exams.

* External Examiner suggested providing students with “exam cribs”. The department does not want to do this. The AD(T) agreed with the department view.
* The issue was raised of the short deadline given to the External Examiner to turn around exam papers. New admin procedures have been put in place to deal with this issue.

7.2 Postgraduate

* External Examiner raised issues related to the English language skills of some students. This has been an on-going issue and the department has put in place measures to improve student’s English. Staff spend time supporting students with English language issues. The External Examiner commented on the poor quality of written English in project reports. In 09/10 there were a number of border-line reports that the External Examiner was asked to look at. This meant the External Examiner saw “bottom-end” of the student reports rather than the full spread.
* Performance of students in the exam for MPP140. This exam required students to apply knowledge to real world problems. Consideration has been given to changing the format of the exam.
* Issues of short time scale to review material.

**8. Issues Raised by Professional Accreditation Bodies**

The Institution of Engineering Designers (IED) visited in November 2009 to accredit the DEM programme. No issues of concern were raised by IED and the programme was awarded the full five years membership accreditation. IED noted that the programme would require more workshop practice elements if IEng accreditation status was being sought.

**9. Discussions on Institutional Issues**

9.1 Attendance Monitoring

Attendance records are kept for most modules and attendance is generally good. APR submission contained examples of the records kept by the department

9.2 Contact Hours

Contact hours are already high with students being timetabled 3 hours per week per 10 credit module, including time in labs. This results in approximately 25 contact hours a week and the department has no intention of increasing contact hours.

9.3 Prompt Return of Assessment and Related Feedback

In 2009, QEO supported staff within the Department to review 8 modules with respect to ILOs and assessment criteria. Departmental T&LC has overseen some changes to assessment (addressing coursework bunching by moving assessment task in final year project, addressing differentiation of ability by changing the exam format in A103). Additionally, the Department has drafted a Code of Practice for internal examiners to help maintain robustness within the assessment process.

QEO recommendations

* Responsible Examiner for PG project module to be contacted directly and offered QEO involvement in reviewing module specification.

**ACTION:** Dawn Dawson to provide Caroline Smith with contact details

Department is aware of the University’s position on generic exam feedback but at the time of writing, is still considering how best to fulfil this obligation.

QEO recommendations

* QEO to contact Teaching Co-ordinator and offer some support in the construction of generic exam feedback.

9.4 Assessment Balance and Load

Department is reviewing the amount of assessment for final year students in order to reduce the assessment load. Changes will be introduced in 11/12.

9.5 Assessment Criteria for Projects

Teaching Co-ordinator confirmed at pre APR meeting 24.01.11 that changes have been made to the UG project modules. These changes include a review of intended learning outcomes, assessment criteria and assessment tasks.

**10. Other**

10.1 Student Charter

Department already has a statement of expectations which is given to new students at Induction. It considers the details of a Student Charter to be very important and suggests that both the PVC(R) and the PVC(E) also endorse the charter.

**ACTION**: Caroline Smith to inform Maurice Fitzgerald about Materials document

10.2 Percentage Part Contribution to Degree Classification

Department considers that Part A should contribute to the degree classification. No objections to moving to a more standard part contribution across the university.

10.3 Induction and Support for Returners

Department already had a coherent induction programme for returning students, organised by Dick Heath, UG Tutor. Department is linked to Registry “Returners” page <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/returners/> and has its own FAQ page on Department intranet.

QEO recommendations

*None arising*

**11.0 Issues Raised by Staff**

* DANS- Staff in the department would like a code of practice to help them better support students registered with DANS.
* Problem of providing feedback to students on individual investigative project reports once students have left the university
* Restructuring of MSc programmes in response to student comments. Issues arise with industrial lecturers who have limited availability and often have to give all their lectures on one day. Moving away from the block taught format might mean losing the valuable industrial input to modules.

**ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW**

**Wolfson School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering**

Date of Meeting: 4th February 2011

Present: Jane Horner (ADT), Caroline Smith (Teaching Centre), Rob Parkin (HOS), Memis Acar, Peter Wilmot, Paul King, John Edwards, Paul Leaney, Bob Young, Tony Sutton, Bob Wood, Kathy White, Helen Sankey, Bhav Mistry, Georgina Gray Ridgeway

**1. Programmes Reviewed**

MEng Mechanical Engineering (MEng Mech)

BEng Mechanical Engineering (BEng Mech)

MEng Product Design Engineering (MEng PDE)

BEng Product Design Engineering (BEng PDE)

BEng Manufacturing Engineering (& Management) (MEM)

MEng Innovative Manufacturing Engineering (IME)

BSc Sports Technology (Sports Tech)

MSc Advanced Engineering (AE)

MSc Advanced Manufacturing Engineering and Management (AMEM)

MSc Engineering Design and Manufacture (EDM)

MSc Engineering Design (ED)

MSc Mechatronics

MSc Mechanical Engineering (ME)

**2. Actions Since the PPR Meeting**

PPR was held in May 2010. The School provided a formal written response to LTC in July 2010. Main points to note regarding the response

* New BSc Engineering Management started in Oct 10. Six students were recruited in the first intake.
* Discussions were ongoing regarding the introduction of biomedical engineering degrees. Department has now decided not to start new programmes in this area
* A review of MEng and BEng programmes had been started and is still ongoing
* The School was going to ensure that level 7 modules taught in Part C clearly specify level 7 outcomes. Module outcomes have now been reviewed for level 6 and level 7 modules
* The School was going to review its assessment strategy to address issues of variable coursework weighting. Also was going to address the apparent over assessment of UG students*.* This is ongoing
* The School was going to ensure that students were provided with clear marking criteria for coursework*.* This is ongoing
* The School was going to ensure that all staff provide students with timely feedback on coursework*.* This is ongoing and HOD will check that staff are returning marked coursework on time

**ACTION**: Monitor the return dates of marked coursework

* The School has introduced several measures to encourage staff to use the full marking range

**ACTION**: Review dynamic range of marks given in 10/11 to determine if measures to encourage staff were effective

* Part B progression rates to be monitored more closely
* Ongoing review of Integrated Studies modules to enhance students’ transferable skills
* In Week 12, staff will feedback on previous year’s exam papers to assist student exam preparation

**3. Actions Since the NSS**

The School provided a commentary on their performance in the NSS over the last three years. Some concern that the School NSS scores had fallen slightly compared to other departments in the 2010 survey. An underlying issue could be the closer of the computer lab for out of hours working, which up-set some students. Feedback to students has been made a priority and will be discussed at individual staff PDR meetings. The School is working to improve feedback scores across the portfolio of programmes

At the NSS meeting with the AD(T), held in October 2010, the following three actions were agreed

1. Determine reasons for disparity between programmes for responses to questions regarding receiving detailed feedback on coursework and the helpfulness of the feedback. Less than 50% of PDM students gave a positive response to questions regarding these questions, much lower than other programmes in the School.

Staff have spoken to graduates from PDM about these issues. It was identified that PDM need to form more of an identity as a student group. Good practice from the Mech Programmes will be transferred to PDM.

2. NSS to be discussed at Staff Student Committee

3. HOS to talk to student groups regarding NSS

**4. Report on Programme Data**

4.1 Undergraduate

**Admissions**

* Increased total application to Mech programmes from both Home/EU students and International Students. BEng applications increased while MEng decreased changing the entry profile*.* This was the result of increasing the entry requirements for 10 entry.
* Significant increase in international intake to Mech. Slight decrease in Home/EU intake. Increased A Level scores on both MEng and BEng
* PDE- increased applications over last three years. Intake in Oct 10 same as Oct 09.
* PDE-Increase in A level scores. Also a decrease in number of non A level student entry. The School is now recruiting less BTEC applicants to the programme.
* MEM- Intakes are small compared to 2008.
* IME – Applications are decreasing but the entry standard is excellent This is a sponsored programme but there are recruitment issue due to the public perception of manufacturing degrees
* Sports Tech – Significant increase in applications from 08 to 09 and 10 entry. However there was a decrease in intake numbers in 10 entry*.* Excellent intake standards for the entry cohort. However the School may have to drop the offer if it wishes to recruit more students on the programme.
* Withdrawal figures are small across all programmes and are mostly transfers between programmes in the School

**Progression**

* Mech – Progression rate for Part B in June 10 was 71%
* Mech- Part A progression rate in June 10 was much lower for MEng (74%) than BEng (82%). Thisisdue toMEng having a higher progression hurdle than BEng.
* BEng PDE- Part B progress was only 53%

**ACTION**- Review progression data to determine reasons for poor performance

* MEM- Progression is poor especially considering the small cohorts
* IE- Excellent Progression data

**Attainment**

Good spread of degree results on all programmes. Points to note

* MEng Mech – 47 students out of 49 received either a 1st or a 2.1
* MEng PDE – Only 1st and 2.1 awarded in July 10
* MEM- Mainly 2.2 awarded.
* Sports Tech –Two 1st awarded but 22 2.1s awarded (See 7.1 EE comment). This is a similar profile to previous years

4.2 Postgraduate

**Admissions**

* AE – Very small intake , but programme is viable with small numbers as all modules are part of existing programmes.
* AMEM- Intake decreased in 10/11
* EDM – Intakes remain small
* Mechtronics – no intake in 10/11. No longer recruiting to this programme
* ME- Intake is growing over the years with significant Home Intake. Students are BEng graduates from other universities. The School is reasonably selective over which universities to recruit from to ensure students have the correct profile for the programme.

**Attainment**

Distinctions awarded on all programmes. Attainment of awards is excellent

**5. Issues Raised by Student Feedback on Modules**

5.1 Undergraduate

* Issues with feedback on several modules
* Software issues with MMB301 Engineering Computing

5.2 Postgraduate

None

**6. Issues Raised by Staff Student Committees**

6.1 Undergraduate

* Increased number of mobile phones being used in lectures. This has improved in 10/11, with the usage of phones dropping.
* Computing faculties, Students complain of lack 24 hour access issues

6.2 Postgraduate

* Size of coursework assignment for MMP409 Sustainable Development (5000 words for 20%). The balance of assessments is this module is being reviewed for 11/12

**ACTION**: Review module assessments weightings for 11/12

* MMP409 repeats material from a Part C module. The School is fully aware of this issue and is trying to take account of the background of all students taking the module
* Behaviour in the exam hall. This was a complaint from students about the behaviour of certain students in the exam hall.

**ACTION**: Discuss acceptable behaviour in exams with student groups before the exam starts

* Timing of Computer Aided Eng Module (too close to end of term)
* Introduction to Control and Mechanisms exam paper, issue with questions on programming. This module is no longer taught to students
* Use of multiple rooms across campus on block taught modules. This was only a problem in 09/10 due to increased size of student groups. Has not occurred in 10/11

**7. Issues Raised by External Examiners**

7.1 Undergraduate

* MEng Mech- More consideration should be given to the moderation of group projects to ensure parity. The response from the School is that projects are moderated

**ACTION**: Ensure moderation process is clear to External Examiner on next visit

* Sports Tech- Need to monitor degree classifications year on year to ensure spread of awards EE questioned if there should be more 1sts
* MMC910 Laser Materials Processing – EE would like to see examples of student coursework. This module is taught by a new member of staff in 10/11 who be setting different coursework
* MMC901 Digital Image Processing- EE queried difference between exam and cswk average 25%. This was a very small student group and the School considers the difference to be acceptable.

7.2 Postgraduate

* EE would like more detailed comments on report to add his understanding of the marking. 2nd Markers should provide written comments as well. Moderation process does not seem to have been followed. The response from the School was that the EE wanted comments written on the reports rather than on separate reporting sheets
* **ACTION**: Ensure moderation process is clear to External Examiner on next visit

**8. Issues Raised by Professional Accreditation Bodies**

Next accreditation visit is 2011

**9. Discussions on Institutional Issues**

9.1 Attendance Monitoring

Examples of records were supplied in the APR paperwork for both UG and PG modules. Sample attendance records are taken for Part A. Students who do not attend are contacted and asked to see staff. PGT have a sign in sheet in every module

9.2 Contact Hours

Contact hours are high for modules. Students have plenty of opportunities to interact with academic staff.

9.3 Prompt Return of Assessment and Related Feedback

HOS suggested that Faculty QEO look at the PDE programme to see how assessment and feedback could be improved. This was related to the response in the NSS for these programmes

**ACTION**: School to select PDE modules with poor student feedback to review with QEO

Marked coursework is currently to students either returned by staff in lectures or via the General Office.

ACTION: Consider returning all marked coursework via the General Office to allow monitoring of return dates

9.4 Assessment Balance and Load

School guidelines exist for the student contact hours/assessment load per 10 credit module. HOS wants all staff to follow the guidelines

The feeling was that modularisation had increased the amount of assessment. The School is currently looking at restructuring all their programmes to reduce student assessment load.

Summary of current situation on Generic Exam Feedback

Department appears to have only one module which is 100% examination (MMC606) plus one module which has 90% examination (MMC104). Both these modules have worked examples/model exam answers available on Learn (accessed 08.02.11). However, there are a large number of modules weighted 80% examination and Departmental T&LC has discussed how best to offer generic exam feedback. Currently, T&LC considering the use of week 12 revision sessions to provide “common pitfalls to avoid”.

QEO recommendations

* QEO to provide some examples of generic exam feedback for consideration.

9.5 Assessment Criteria for Projects

Changes to “U/G projects/dissertations” assessment since last APR

The requirement for differentiation between level 6 and level 7 project modules was discussed by the Departmental T&LC and changes have been made to the module specifications. In addition to meeting with the Responsible Examiner for the “main” project modules, QEO also met other departmental staff on 14.01.11 and discussed aspects of project modules eg clarity of assessment criteria, award of marks for student effort (how to evidence this mark), use of marking proformas to support staff/students and the number of individual elements of assessment.

The Department has developed a set of generic assessment criteria and staff involved with UG projects are encouraged to use these criteria. (PG projects also have a set of criteria in a slightly different format). For students, it is hoped that these generic criteria will signal what is required and will encourage questions when they are unsure. For staff, it is hoped that these generic criteria will encourage staff use of the full marking range.

Changes to assessment of other modules

At the invitation of the Responsible Examiner, as similar review of the PG project module has also been initiated.

QEO recommendations

* Department to consider the mark awarded for student effort within UG projects, particularly how this is evidenced by staff and to consider the relevance of the assessment methods/tasks within UG projects – particularly seeking to strategically reduce assessment if appropriate
* Within Product Design engineering, QEO to work with Programme Director to evaluate a sample of modules with reference to: intended learning outcomes, aligned assessment criteria and efficient feedback to students.

**10. Other**

10.1 Student Charter

Peter Wilmot has already discussed this with Maurice Fitzgerald. The School is supportive of the introduction of the charter.

10.2 Percentage Part Contribution to Degree Classification

The School would like to keep the current percentage part contributions but would be happy to shift percentages slightly. For MEng, Part C and D have the same weighting as the individual investigative project is in Part C. The School would like Part A to contribute a small amount (10%) to the degree classification to motivate student engagement.

10.3 Induction and Support for Returners

Changes since last APR

Department offers planned “welcome back” talks for returning students given by HoD or nominee. Returners are also supported via the Personal Tutoring system (particularly at UG level).

QEO recommendations

* Consider linking to the Registry “Returners” page <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/returners/> (currently undergoing some revisions)
* A Department specific “Returners’ page” (currently under consideration) and a HoD Newsletter (also under consideration) would clearly be useful additional ways to ensure students are kept updated/reminded of their obligations.