

Dr Martin Harrison
Associate Dean (Teaching)
Faculty of Science
Telephone: 2871 Fax: 223969 Secretary: 2882



E-mail: M.C.Harrison@lboro.ac.uk

Faculty of Science Report on Annual Programme Reviews for 2007-08

1 May 2009

1. Timing of APRs

In accordance with University quality procedures for Annual Programme Review, a formal meeting was held with the following Schools/Departments:

Chemistry	29 January 2009
Computer Science	21 January 2009
Information Science	16 January 2009
Materials	13 January 2009
Physics	23 January 2009
School of Mathematics	27 January 2009

Minutes have been circulated to HoDs/Teaching Coordinators as appropriate.

Departmental Summaries follow in 2.

Human Sciences underwent a Periodic Programme Review in May 2009.

The Faculty Quality Enhancement Officer (QEO) attended all APRs and PPR. Her APR reports are in 3.

2. Departmental Summaries

Chemistry	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof Michael Ward, External Examiner had commented about the high credit value of coursework on the MChem programme, which was higher than the national benchmark. It was noted that the department has changed this for 2009 entry. 2. All other issues had been satisfactorily addressed. 	
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Departmental SEFS quotas have now been agreed. 2. Overall UG recruitment is excellent. 3. PGT recruitment was good, although it remains difficult to recruit home students. 4. Environmental Studies MSc only recruits small numbers. 	
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progression criteria from the IFP at LC have been agreed. 2. Progression, particularly at Part B, is an issue on some UG programmes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SD monitor 2. TC monitor Part B progression
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG: No major issues. 2. PGT: Most international students pass but some, whose first language is not English, make slower progress and need to resit. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. TC monitor
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No issues. 2. The department receives very positive reports back from employers particularly in relation to the PGT programmes. 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Variability in personal tutoring across departments b) Possibility of Physical Sciences resource centre c) SEFS student mentors 2. UG: No major issues – CMB002 scored some responses less than 3. 3. PGT: No major issues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) SD to progress b) Refer to Chemistry Teaching Review c) SD to consider 2. TC: monitor CMB002
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2008 survey results were not quite as good as in previous years. 2. Feedback proved to be an issue in the responses and the department is applying for funding for a project to look at feedback. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HoD to talk to finalists.
<p>SSLC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS Minor issues relating to lab demonstrators (not enough), CW deadline bunching and maths tutorials (students want more!). 2. UG Timetabling issue (7 hours of lectures on Friday for Part A students). 3. PGT: Some CW deadline issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Highlight current constraints to registry
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports were all generally positive. Minor issues raised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS Low average marks for the Maths 2 and Physics 2 modules. 	

<p>2. UG Funding for final year projects. Organization of vivas for international students.</p> <p>3. PGT Mixed ability of cohort.</p>	
<p>Other</p> <p>1. It was agreed that in future the statistics from the previous years' APR does not need be provided.</p> <p>2. Transfer of the SEFS programme to the department had gone well.</p> <p>3. SEFS: staff had requested more guidelines for marking the project.</p> <p>4. SEFS: student attendance was a problem.</p> <p>5. English language was a problem with some international PGT students.</p> <p>6. There are no major quality issues, although CW deadlines still seem to be an issue with students.</p> <p>7. Assessment & Feedback</p> <p>8. Learn</p> <p>9. Department to conduct a Teaching Review</p> <p>10. Credit value requirements of joint programmes</p>	<p>1. ADT to confirm with Registry</p> <p>3. SD to provide</p> <p>7. Provide samples & examples of good practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back</p> <p>8. Ensure modules meet minimum presence</p> <p>10. TC apply to CSC for exemption</p>

Computer Science	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Item 5. Difficulties working with Electrical Engineering relating to timetabling and availability of staff have been partially resolved. Difficulties with one particular member of staff remain but both departments are committed to delivering the module in question. Item 6. The department felt the APR forms don't ask the right questions with regard to student feedback. Discussions had taken place with the QEO, although mainly with regard to the student feedback forms. All other issues had been satisfactorily addressed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC to send suggestions to ADT
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall UG recruitment is excellent but Viability of Computer Science & E-business was an issue. Overall PGT international recruitment was good, although the IT programme only attracts small numbers. PGT UK/EU recruitment was under target. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keep under review Keep under review
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Part B progression and lack of engagement is an issue on the Computer Science UG programme. Part A progression is an issue on the Computing and Management UG programme. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC Monitor TC monitor
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UG: Large number of fails on Computer Science at Part C. PGT: Overall achievement was good. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC monitor Part C pass rates
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No issues The department receives very positive reports back from employers particularly in relation to the PGT programmes. 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UG: issues relating to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Part A library provision Delivery of some Part B modules PGT: No major issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC/Academic librarian TC
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2008 survey results were very good; feedback was worst scoring area. 	
<p>SSLC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 26 November 2008: issue of whether placements in the business or financial sectors would be approved for ITMB students. Placement Tutor suggested that students send him copies of the job description before applying and he would advise them. 	
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports received were all very positive.</p> <p>Reports from 2 EEs were still outstanding</p>	<p>TC: forward copies to ADT</p>
<p>Other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low lecture attendance rates, particularly semester 2 of Parts A & B 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC monitor

<p>2. No place on APR form to record reports from placement students. Section 4 could be renamed 'Reports from Employers of Recent Graduates and/or Placement Students'.</p> <p>3. Some difficulties with Personal Tutoring arrangements</p> <p>4. Quality Manager's report Purpose was unclear; there were no actions.</p> <p>5. Assessment & Feedback</p> <p>6. Learn</p>	<p>2. Registry to consider</p> <p>3. TC to monitor</p> <p>4. TC</p> <p>5. Provide samples & examples of good practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back.</p> <p>6. Ensure modules meet minimum presence</p>
---	---

Information Science	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>All actions have been completed. The following were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Item 3, bullet 3. The department has re-opened discussions with the Social Sciences department regarding a proposed new Publishing with Communication programme. Item 4, Information Management and Computing Programme. The first attempt failure rate at Part B had fallen. The average pass rate on the BS modules on the IMBS programme was around 50%. Department is working closely with MLSC to try and improve this. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> HoD on-going DS on going
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall UG recruitment is excellent UK/EU PGT recruitment was good IKM: there has been a fall in PGT international recruitment, mainly to do with a drop in the Chinese market. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Try to stimulate international recruitment
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Progression after SAP was generally good. Number of withdrawals, 9, from IMBS programme noted. 	
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UG: generally excellent (IMBS & IMC) PGT: Overall achievement was good. Number of international students needing to resit dissertation modules on IKM noted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC to consider dissertation preparation
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No issues 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No major issues 	
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2008 survey results were very good again, although response rate had decreased. 	
<p>SSLC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Some coursework deadlines problems 	
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>All reports received were very positive. Minor issues raised were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prof David Finkelstein: anomalies in coursework feedback and the system of assessing the final year dissertations. Prof Julie McLeod: inconsistency in the double marking of projects. Dr Mark Sanderson: consistency of feedback should be improved. Dr Ian Rowlands: report has not yet been received (but said to have given a very good verbal report) Dr Sharon Cox: improvements in consistency of the referencing requirements across modules. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC TC TC to review HR: forward copy to ADT TC
<p>Other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Poor student attendance had been highlighted across all UG programmes. The department is considering ways to attempt to improve this. Suggestions include setting more in-class assessments and monitoring attendance. Assessment & Feedback 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TC Provide samples & examples of good

3. Learn

practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back.

3. Ensure modules meet minimum presence

Materials	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>All actions have been completed. The following were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lecturing/Communication: It was not clear why attendance by lecturing staff at the 'Communicate' course had not prevented further comments from students about not being able to understand the staff concerned. Department will give feedback to Jan Tennant. 	1. TC
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall UG recruitment is excellent UK/EU PGT international recruitment was good The LMCP programme continues to thrive and initiatives to boost PGT recruitment look good. Temporary problems with Singapore market. 	
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Progression at Part A and in some programmes at Part B is low and needs monitoring. 	1. TC
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UG: generally good. PGT: generally good but small number of project failures noted. 	
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Employment prospects for these UG cohorts remains very good. 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No major issues. 	
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2008 survey results were excellent results last year; department is taking action to maintain its position. HoD to see all students in February, to cover NSS issues, project feedback sessions and an 'Introduction to PhD' presentation. Some negative comments about organization/management of some aspects of assessment/deadlines - it was felt that these were probably due to the changes in course structure implemented over several years (2008-09 being the first year of the re-structured Part-C). 	
<p>SSLC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for the formatting of lab and placement reports were not available. In fact this information appears in a number of places such as programme handbook and on the web. Also students are able to get feedback on their first lab report during Personal Tutor sessions in week four. Students should be made more aware of this. 	1. TC
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>All reports received were very positive. Minor issues raised were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professor I P Jones: concern in relation to the range of marks in examinations; department have taken these comments on board and have already implemented policies on high / low average marks. New form to be piloted. Professor F R Jones: concern that he had not been able to interview as many students as he would like prior to the Programme Board. Department will arrange for him to visit to interview students well 	1. TC 2. TC/Administrator

before the next Programme Board.	
<p>Other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance at mathematics lectures was poor. The department was working with the MEC to improve this. 2. Assessment & Feedback 3. Learn 4. Complete Programme Specifications 5. Module ILOs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TC 2. Provide samples & examples of good practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back. 3. Ensure modules meet minimum presence 4. Administrator/Programme Directors 5. TC / QEO

Mathematics	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>The following recommendations and responses were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the ILOs for its programmes against the FHEQ Necessary changes to be implemented via Annual Update 2009 2. Review how it monitored changes at programme level in the light of incremental changes to modules Mechanisms to put in place through TALC. 3. Introduce more structured induction procedures for returning students particularly in Part B Mechanisms for dealing with this include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) returners' website b) meetings with personal tutors; this could be more proactive (with tutors making more effort to contact 'missing' students) c) Loughborough-Shandong students have dedicated induction. The department is satisfied that its induction procedures are sufficient. 4. Consider the lack of student engagement particularly in lecture attendance, vis a vis the availability of resources on Learn The department will conduct an experiment in the second semester with the Calculus module. Attendance and access to Learn will be monitored and compared with performance. 5. Consider its procedures for ensuring that quality enhancement was addressed Further discussions with Jan Tennant were needed to clarify this recommendation. 6. Seeks further support from partner departments in the administration/management of, and recruitment to, joint honours programmes. This is a generic weakness of joint programmes at LU. However, the department is dependent on good support from a number of partner departments and will continue to develop and maintain good links with them. It was noted that 3 link tutor attended the APR meeting. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TC>TALC 2. TC>TALC 3. (b) TC>personal tutors 4. TC 5. TC & JT 6. On-going
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall UG recruitment is excellent with increasing entry grades. 2. PG UK/EU recruitment remained difficult but PGT International recruitment was now benefitting from the successful 'Shandong initiative'. 	
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low summer pass rates on some programmes are of concern, although the department feels that many students now accept this as the norm following A-level practice. 	
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG: generally good 2. PGT: Weak MPiF intake was noted; but 4 out of 14 distinctions & 4 module resits 3. PGCert Mathematics Support for Students with Dyslexia and Dyscalculia in HE/FE: encouraging start with 5 from 7 students successful in its first year. Staff health problems meant no recruitment in 2008. 	

Destinations 1. No issues	
Student feedback – module feedback 1. No major issues	
Student feedback – NSS 1. The 2008 NSS results were an improvement on the previous year. The department hopes to maintain these results in 2009. 2. In response to the demand for more feedback to students following the previous NSS, some staff now provide exemplars of good feedback to students; these will be discussed and shared.	
SSLC UG programmes 1. Only two meetings per year were offered whereas the university currently requires a third meeting should be offered. 2. Actions and responses to them are not always clear in UG minutes. 3. Programme tutors had raised the issue of low attendance at lectures and stressed the link between attendance and achievement. Students reps were asked to feed this back. 4. Part B students had raised concerns about prior knowledge of physics assumed for MAB155 Particle Dynamics. TC had spoken to the lecturer concerned; it was not clear if the situation had improved. 5. Although assessment and feedback are a recurring theme throughout, students can't agree on how to improve the situation. PG programmes 6. There is a general dislike of group coursework among the MSc students. However, being able to work in groups is an important skill and this would not be removed from the programme.	1. TC 2. TC 3. Reps 4. TC to monitor 5. TC>TALC review
External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses All reports received were very positive. Minor issues raised were: 1. Dr Litton: clarification of wording on some papers. 2. Mr Roper: lack of student engagement by Materials students on MAB303 and MAB305. TALC was reviewing this with a view to teaching them separately in future. 3. Dr Pollak PGCert programme: confidentiality of the portfolios.	2. TC>TALC to review 3. TC>responsible examiner
Other 1. Assessment & Feedback 2. Learn 3. Programme Portfolio a) Possibility of introducing a new BSc programme in Mathematics with Mathematics Education. b) Plans to replace the MSc Industrial Mathematical Modelling programme with a new programme in Mathematics for Emerging Technologies, probably from 2010 onwards.	1. Provide samples & examples of good practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back. 2. Ensure modules meet minimum presence

Physics	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>The following recommendations and responses were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 11.2(a) - It was recommended that the department formalised the management structure and prepare a management document identifying departmental administrative responsibilities. 2. 11.2(b) - The department was advised to address the need for a more strategic approach towards programme development UG – the department proposes to introduce two new programmes for 2009 and 2010 entry and to discontinue programmes which are not recruiting sufficiently. PGT - provision is being reviewed by an internal panel with a view to a major overhaul for 2010 entry. 3. 11.2(c) – The department was advised to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) review the aims and ILOs of the MPhys programmes to differentiate them from the BSc degrees Programme specs have been updated. The modules are currently being updated. (ii) ensure there are sufficient level 7 credits in the MPhys progs to meet FHEQ and Bologna requirements. (iii) review the ILOs for the joint programmes Programme specs have been updated. The modules are currently being updated. (iv) review the skills delivered and assessed within the programmes and how they are presented within the various ILO sections of the programme specs. Programme specs have been updated. The modules are currently being updated. (v) keep under review the heavy proportion of written exams and ensure students are offered a wider variety of assessment The department has taken this comment on board. Group work has been introduced into one module and other changes are being considered. However, on the whole the department is happy with its exam proportion and would prefer not to change it further. On the joint courses the proportion of the partner department modules is dictated by the partner department. (vi) foster more group work especially at Part A The department has introduced group work into Part A Information Skills module and made it compulsory. (vii) consider further measures to address the high first attempt failure rates at Part A Department tried various measure to encourage weaker students but take-up and attendance was poor, so these measures were withdrawn. It was noted that the department is a popular second choice and therefore many students enter via Clearing. The department feels the way forward is to recruit better students and has raised it entry offer to 300/320 for 2009. The department has re-vamped induction day and holds an 'ice-breaking' meeting. Tutorial attendance during 08/09 has improved - better attendance should encourage better engagement. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On-going: HoD to submit to the Dean 2. On-going 3. On-going with QEO On-going On-going with QEO On-going with QEO Considered but on-going Done On-going

<p>(viii) re-vamp promotional materials</p> <p>4. 11.2(d) - To review its approach to the treatment of students at the 2(ii)/3rd borderline The department has previously preferred to viva students rather than fail them and then make them resit the following academic year. The department feels its has made moves to tighten up this process but will monitor it and keep it under review.</p> <p>5. 11.2(e) - To consider whether programme regulations for joint programmes should prescribe minimum progression/award criteria in each subject Will apply the same progression minima as the partner department.</p> <p>6. 11.2(f) - To keep its use of condonement in line with University guidelines. The department has had a higher than University average use of condonement, which should be reserved for special circumstances. Also, the department seems to see a conflict between the condonement guidelines and their desire not to disadvantage any student. This matter is not entirely resolved, although it was noted that the situation had improved since last year.</p> <p>7. 11.2(g) - To consult Facilities Management with a view to getting the labs re-furbished. Department will do this once it knows whether or not it will be moving.</p> <p>8. 11.2(h) - To consult with the HSE office to ensure that best practice is being followed as regards the conduct of risk assessments for student lab work. The departmental safety officer has been made aware of the recommendation and has consulted the HSE office. It would appear nothing further had been done.</p> <p>9. 11.2(i) - To ensure that there is a systematic rolling programme of lab equipment replacement The department is replacing equipment as resources allow. However, a recent SRIF bid was unsuccessful.</p> <p>10. 11.2(j) - To consider ways of improving uptake of professional placements A new placement tutor was appointment in 2007. Uptake has already improved.</p> <p>11. 11.2(k) - To encourage staff to develop e-learning resources The department had not adapted well to the introduction of Moodle and claim that many students had also complained about it. This was not the experience of the University as a whole. The department was encouraged to contact and make use of the FeLO (Faculty e-Learning Officer - previously OLDO). The department needs to ensure they meet the minimum presence requirements.</p> <p>12. 11.2(l) - To share information about programme partnership arrangements with relevant members of staff in the Registry to enable any QA implication to be checked Leicester partnership proved unsuccessful; no partnerships currently exist.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>4. On-going</p> <p>5. Done</p> <p>6. Considered but not yet solved</p> <p>7. On-going</p> <p>8. Considered but not solved</p> <p>9. On-going</p> <p>10. Done</p> <p>11. On-going</p> <p>12. Issue no longer exists</p>
Applications	

<p>1. Overall UG recruitment is good, although not many international students are recruited. It was suggested to target international students already in the UK.</p> <p>2. BSc Sports Science & Physics: average entry grade for 2008 entry is very low. The department should not take students with such low entry grades in future.</p> <p>3. BSc Physics with/and Management: Applications, intake and entry grades for these programmes are low and falling. Department is considering either deleting or re-packaging these programmes.</p> <p>4. PGT programmes have small numbers but the quality of the students is good.</p>	<p>1. Admissions Tutor</p> <p>2. Admissions Tutor</p> <p>3. TC</p>
<p>Progression</p> <p>1. Department has a higher than average withdrawal across all UG programmes and should keep this under review. It should consider putting weaker students on SEFS in future.</p> <p>2. The main issue is the Part A failure rates, which need to be kept under review.</p> <p>3. Part B June BSc Engineering Physics pass rates were low.</p>	<p>1. TC / Admissions Tutor</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC to monitor</p>
<p>Attainment</p> <p>1. UG: generally good</p> <p>2. PGT: see Applications</p>	
<p>Destinations</p> <p>1. No issues</p>	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <p>1. UG: no major issues but:</p> <p>a) The Sports Science and Physics students highlighted the fact that they thought staff should make more use of Learn. Also see PPR Issues [11.2(k)] above.</p> <p>b) PHD230 Quantum Computing students requested more tutorial questions and coursework. Coursework and presentations will be under consideration when the modspeccs are reviewed but no decision has been made yet.</p> <p>c) The department is giving generic feedback to students. The policy of waiting until staff student committee meetings to flag up cases where feedback is insufficient is not good practice and the department should evaluate this on an on-going basis.</p> <p>2. PGT: no issues</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>TC</p> <p>TC</p> <p>TC</p>
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <p>1. The NSS results were very good again. The department is hoping to improve on the results again this year. They will host an event to promote PhD opportunities and highlight the importance of the NSS.</p>	<p>1. TC</p>
<p>SSLC</p> <p>UG programmes</p> <p>1. Minutes don't always record a good action trail with clear evidence that issues raised are dealt with.</p> <p>2. Students feel that staff should make more use of Learn. See PPR issues [11.2(k)] above.</p> <p>3. Students complained that assumed Maths knowledge varies between lecturers. All lecturers should be made aware of current Math A-level syllabus.</p> <p>4. Some students commented about material being too advanced. The department needs to review the material in the light of their intake.</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p>

<p>PG programmes</p> <p>5. None</p>	
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports received were generally positive. Minor issues raised were:</p> <p>1. Prof Nigel Hussey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There was a logistics issue to resolve regarding the amount of information given to the External in advance of the MSc viva voce exams. b) UG module questions should be clearly marked as seen or unseen. Moderation system should ensure this happens. <p>2. Prof W Y Liang (UG programmes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Comment about national subject benchmarks. TC and QEO had looked at this when reviewing the ILOs. Programmes are also accredited by IOP. b) Overgenerous marking on section A of written papers (also raised by Professor Hussey): department felt his comment refers to question one only. This is designed to test basic knowledge and accounts for one-third of the total marks. Department will keep this under review but do not plan to change the format at present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) TC/Administrator b) TC/Administrator 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) TC to review
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment & Feedback</p> <p>2. Learn</p> <p>3. Programme Portfolio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) UG: Information Technology and Physics & Physics and Computing, Both programmes have been deleted for 2009 entry. b) UG: Physics with Cosmology now on stream wef. 2009 entry. c) Programmes in Medical Physics and Financial Physics under consideration. d) PGT: programme in Econo-Physics to incorporate modules which will be attractive to the Chinese market under consideration. <p>4. Teaching Staff Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Low attendance and high withdrawal rate Induction day has been re-organised; so far attendance at tutorials seems to be better during 08/09. Withdrawal rate seems to be lower at Part A. Personal tutoring system has also been improved. b) Structure of the MSc programme. Prof Alexandrov is chairing a committee to look at its future structure and management. See PPR issues 11.2(b)] above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide samples & examples of good practice to QEO. QEO to collate across Faculty & report back. 2. Ensure modules meet minimum presence.

3. Quality Enhancement Officer Summary Report of Annual Programme Reviews (Faculty of Science) 2007 – 2008

Context

This report summarises the findings of APRs held in the following departments during January 2009: Chemistry, Computer Science, Information Science, Materials, School of Mathematics and Physics.

The report details the conclusions reached by the QEO (Science), recorded as an aid to determining relevant quality enhancement activities. This report should be read in conjunction with the AD(T)'s summary report.

Key issues arising

1. Poor progression rates at Part A and/or B

Four departments (Chemistry, Computer Science, School of Mathematics and Physics) expressed concern at the disappointing numbers of students failing modules at the first attempt with associated impact on progression rates. Clearly, staff have debated this predicament and explored the underlying reasons, suggesting potential causes such as students being taken onto courses through clearing/change course offers, lack of competence in certain key subjects, poor attendance/non engagement, poor time management skills and assessment being focussed on end of term examinations rather than continuous assessment.

Actions

- i. QEO (Science) to liaise with Teaching Co-ordinators and follow up any initiatives being undertaken to address the issue during April – November 2009 (see below - emerging examples of effective practice). Report activity on this issue at the Faculty of Science Teaching Co-ordinators' meeting in November 2009.
- ii. QEO (Science) to liaise with QEO (SSH) to provide intelligence for current QEO work on student engagement. To work closely with QEO (SSH) in selecting pilot departments from Faculty of Science for engagement project and ongoing activity.

Outcomes

- i. *No further action for QEO (Science).*
- ii. *No further action for QEO (Science).*

2. English language ability of some post graduate students

Two departments (Chemistry and Information Science) reported problems arising with some post graduate students whose English language abilities impeded their progress. This is despite increasing the IELTS score required for admission and offering support via the personal tutor system.

Action

QEO (Science) to meet with key staff within these two departments and within the University to explore the support available. Work to be completed by the end of the summer term.

Outcome

QEO (Science) to report findings to the AD(T).

3. Variable feedback to students on assessed work

This issue was raised in one department (Information Science) whose staff recognise the need to provide consistent quality of feedback to students, particularly feedback which links to assessment criteria.

Action

QEO (Science) to meet with Teaching Co-ordinator and plan appropriate action.

Outcome

Dependant on the meeting - possibly a short workshop with supporting resources available via the department's web pages.

4. Difficulty in understanding some staff for whom English is a second language

This issue was raised by one department (Materials) as a small but persistent feature of student feedback. Although some advantage has been taken of the “Communicate course” this issue remains.

Action

Director of the Teaching Centre to meet HoD on 6 May.

Outcome

No further action for QEO (Science).

Emerging examples of effective practice

1. Strategies to promote student engagement/boost progression rates

Staff are involved with a number of initiatives aimed at improving the current situation. Depending on what a department sees as the root cause of these issues, strategies target either the perceived lack of student knowledge, the poor attendance of students or the pastoral support on offer to students. These initiatives include:

Making extra staff available to help with practical programming sessions (Computer Science).

Reviewing content of some modules formally at departmental L&TC (Computer Science)

Undertaking a teaching review to examine teaching across all programmes (Chemistry)

Considering the assessment schedule so that examinations after Christmas for Part B students do not find students unprepared (Chemistry)

Working with MEC staff to build a database of discipline specific mathematics examples to be used in teaching (Materials)

Making maths support for Information Management and Business Studies students available within the department (Information Science)

Taking registers whenever possible (Computer Science)

Operating a “traffic light” system for attendance – “amber” e mail when attendance drops below 75%, “red” letter from HoD when attendance drops below 50% (Materials)

Planning to use a swipe card system to monitor attendance for a module in the new academic year and compare attendance and performance data (Maths)

Teaching Co-ordinator acting as personal tutor to an entire cohort of 52 students and is available prior to a series of (usually well attended) lectures given by external staff. (Computer Science)

Reminding all returning Part B students about workload and attendance (Computer Science)

Year 2 co-ordinator monitoring student absence (Chemistry)

Promoting tutorial attendance by combining academic and personal tutorials (Physics)

Personal tutor contacting tutees each week to maintain contact (Physics)

Offering formative feedback on report writing via personal tutorials (Materials)

Returning students have specific web based information (Maths)

Returning students are emailed and invited to meet with the year tutor (Maths)

Action

i. QEO (Science) to draw up an annotated list of these initiatives undertaken by departments in response to poor progression rates

Outcome

i. Production of resource to be disseminated via Teaching Centre website and via Teaching Co-ordinators

Caroline Smith

QEO (Science)

21.04.09