

Faculty of Science Report on Annual Programme Reviews for 2008-09

7 May 2010

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	25 January 2010
Computer Science	27 January 2010
Ergonomics (Human Sciences)	9 February 2010
Materials	18 January 2010
Physics	4 February 2010
School of Mathematics	29 January 2010

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

Departmental Summaries follow in 2.

Information Science underwent a Periodic Programme Review in April 2010.

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> <p>The department submitted a response document to follow-up the previous APR. All issues had been satisfactorily addressed.</p>	
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS intake is now restricted and offers need to be carefully monitored to ensure the programme does not over-recruit. The number of international applicants has increased. More international students could be recruited to Chemistry Part A via IFP. 2. UG applications and entry qualifications have all increased and recruitment was good. 2009 intake was held back by the University decision not to enter Clearing. HoD expressed concern that the inability to recruit to the UK UG target would impact on the business plan. UG International recruitment, although increased slightly, is relatively small. 3. PGT recruitment is good; however the future ability of the department to continue to teach some specialized modules on the Medicinal and Pharmaceutical Chemistry MSc is of major concern. 4. Environmental Studies MSc only recruits small numbers; its viability will be kept under review. 	4. TC
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part B progression at first attempt is still an issue on some UG programmes. 2. Condonement - the department tracks students who have progressed via the condonement route. Most students condoned at either Part A or Part B recover well. It will continue to monitor this. 	2. TC
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG: No major issues, although attainment at Part C was disappointing for the Chemistry with Forensic Analysis programme. 2. PGT: Most students eventually pass but some, generally those whose first language is not English, make slower progress and need to resit. 	
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No issues – career prospects for graduates are good. 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEFS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Some students dislike the use of Geogebra in MAF001. Its use will be kept under review. b) The timing and quality of feedback to students depends on the policy in any given department and cannot be controlled by SD. 2. UG: No major issues Note: The department participated in an on-line feedback pilot but return rates were much lower than usually received and the statistics therefore meaningless. The department would like to return to the old paper-based method. 3. PGT: No major issues. 	1. SEFS a) SD
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2009 survey results were good with the department being rated 3rd for overall satisfaction. 2. Some actions had been suggested to improve NSS results: 	

<p>a) Students had suggested that a booklet similar to the Copycat plagiarism booklet could be developed about feedback. Note: This will be taken forward.</p> <p>b) HoD has written to all finalists to remind them about the timing and importance of the NSS. The department takes a very proactive approach to encouraging students to participate. Each student is sent an information pack containing examples of NSS questions.</p> <p>c) HoD will follow this up with a meeting with finalists in week 1 of semester 2 plus another meeting in week 3.</p> <p>d) The Chemical Society highlights the importance of the NSS.</p>	
<p>SSLC</p> <p>1. There were no serious issues raised.</p> <p>2. The Department's responses to all student feedback, not just Module Feedback, should be an item on every SSC agenda.</p>	2. TC
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports were all impressive with no serious issues raised. Minor issues raised included:</p> <p>1. Some areas of the final year UG syllabus were avoided by the majority of students in the exam. The department will monitor this.</p>	1. TC
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in the future. A number of areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor Co-Tutor is the department's preferred method to record meetings with students. Co-Tutor report suggests 4% of students do not have personal tutors assigned to them. No Chemistry modules require students to engage with their personal tutors but:</p> <p>a) Part A students have timetabled meetings with personal tutors. b) Part B students are requested to meet with their personal tutors following their exams.</p> <p>Students interact with all staff not just their personal tutors. Personal tutoring for SEFS students is still an issue, particularly in one engineering department.</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN 15% of modules do not meet minimum presence requirements.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students From 2010/11 there will be induction for all years.</p> <p>5. Staffing A major issue in the near to medium term is going to be the loss of staff who teach the MSc programme in Medicinal and Pharmaceutical Chemistry. As staff retire and BiT contracts end, some specialized modules will be threatened.</p>	<p>1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR</p> <p>2. ADT to send copy of report to TC>TC to check</p> <p>2. SD to enlist help of ADT Eng</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p>

Computer Science	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>The department submitted a response document to follow-up the previous APR. All actions have been completed. The following additional comments were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Item 6 Student Feedback. Changes had been made to the module Operating Systems, Networks and the Internet following comments via the module questionnaire. Problems still persist with this module despite a change of lecturer. It will be looked at again. 2. The ADT sought clarification of the purpose of the Quality Manager's report because it did not include any actions. It is for internal purposes only and highlights issues to be discussed in other forums e.g. Teaching and Learning committee and the APR meeting. 3. Item 12 Accreditation. Some BSc & MComp accreditation issues remained following the department's 90-day response in December 2008. An Accreditation Action Plan to address the outstanding concerns was produced in July 2009 and a further submission made in November 2009. The department should report the outcome to the ADT, so he can report back to the PVC(T). 4. Accreditation for the MSc programmes would progress when the new MSc programme in Internet Computing and Networking is approved. The Department expects to be ready to discuss this with BCS by summer 2010. 	<p>1. TC</p> <p>3. TC>ADT>PVCT</p> <p>4. TC</p>
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall UG recruitment was very good but held back slightly by the University's decision not to enter Clearing. 2. <i>Computer Science & E-business</i> Viability was an issue; it should be kept under review. 3. Overall PGT international recruitment was good, although UK/EU intake was under target. 4. <i>Information Technology MSc</i> Intake is small and the programme should be kept under review. 	<p>2. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p>
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part B progression is an issue on some UG programmes; there are attendance issues, which the department is attempting to address. 	<p>1. TC Monitor</p>
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG: Although there were still some fails, Computer Science Part C attainment had improved since last year. 2. PGT: Resit numbers were high and the department should check there were no major issues. This should be kept under review. 	<p>2. TC>CM Monitor</p>
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No issues 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The department has its own on-line system that enables staff to review their module feedback. This is published to the students 2. UG: no major issues <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Students still do not think they receive sufficient feedback and requested individual feedback in some modules. Staff feel poor attendance results in students missing feedback opportunities. 	

3. PGT: all feedback was very positive	
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <p>1. 2009 survey results were very good; feedback to students was worst scoring area; department is continuing to look at ways to improve it.</p>	
<p>SSLC</p> <p>1. Students are informed of action the department has taken in response to student feedback on the 'Issue Tracker'. The Quality Manager's report is presented at the SSC meetings.</p> <p>2. The Department's responses to all student feedback, not just Module Feedback, should be an item on every SSC agenda.</p> <p>3. There were no serious issues raised, although engagement was an issue with some of the larger modules. The department will keep the situation under review.</p> <p>4. Feb 2009 meeting. Students raised various issues including whether they were being taught the most appropriate programming languages. The department agreed to look into it.</p> <p>5. Dec 2009 meeting. Proposals for a Buddy Scheme for new students had progressed. An Electrical Engineering student will be invited to the next SSLC meeting to discuss the trial scheme in Electrical Engineering.</p> <p>The purpose and format of tutorials was discussed. Some students felt the current format did not benefit the better students. This would be discussed at the next staff meeting.</p>	<p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p> <p>TC</p>
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports received were generally positive.</p> <p>1. The heavy re-cycling of exam questions and coursework has attracted the attention of External Examiners for two years now; this issue should be addressed this session</p>	<p>1. TC</p>
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations</p> <p>Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in the future. A number of areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor</p> <p>The department is in a transition stage (it previously used Co-Teach) and is encouraging staff to use Co-tutor. Although all students have been allocated a personal tutor, not all are recorded on Co-tutor. There are no modules where students are required to interact with their personal tutors.</p> <p>Final year students have their project supervisors assigned as their personal tutors.</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN</p> <p>There are still 14% of modules not meeting minimum presence requirements. However, some modules are still on Co-Teach because they did not transfer well to LEARN. All modules have resources. The department will keep this under review.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students</p> <p>There is an induction day for Part A and MSc students.</p>	<p>1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR</p> <p>3. TC</p>

<p>Part B, C and D students have a talk given by HoD using an early timetabled lecture slot. The importance of attendance is one topic discussed.</p> <p>There is also an induction session for project students.</p> <p>There is a session at the start of semester 2 for Part C students to discuss the importance of the NSS. The department should consider doing this earlier in the academic year.</p> <p>The department should consider putting a link on the department web pages to the Student Office Returning Students information.</p> <p>5. UG modules</p> <p>Staff raised the issue of poor student attendance. The department now takes registers and follows up students with poor attendance. Some do respond but the department is not sure whether this positive effect will be permanent.</p> <p>6. PG modules</p> <p>Staff reported a high absentee rate from this particular cohort. No particular reason was identified; the 09-10 cohort is much better.</p> <p>7. Central processing of applications</p> <p>This is already done for PGT students. The HoD and admissions tutor will discuss whether this would be appropriate for UGs.</p>	<p>4. TC</p> <p>TC</p> <p>7. HoD/Admissions Tutor</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------

Ergonomics (Human Sciences)	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>The department submitted a response document to follow-up the previous PPR. The only actions discussed were those affecting Ergonomics. The following were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 9.1 The panel recommended that lines of responsibility and the effectiveness of the hierarchy of committees needed to be reviewed. This has been done as a result of the recent interim re-structuring. 2. 12.2(ii) The panel recommended a review of programme ILOs Caroline Smith and PW worked together on the UG programmes. The PG programmes still need to be looked at. 3. 12.2(iii) The panel recommended the department ensure that the qualification descriptors in the FHEQ are used and mentioned in the programme specs. Although there are no subject benchmarks for Ergonomics, the FHEQ was used when reviewing UG programme specifications. 4. 12.2(iv) The panel recommended reviewing the methods of assessment. This is still on-going. 5. 12.2(viii) The panel recommended reviewing consistency between staff in terms of the amount and timeliness of feedback to students. Staff are encouraged to give timely and useful feedback. There was a problem with one particular module last year because the lecturer gave very thorough and therefore very late feedback. This will be monitored in future through the moderation system. 6. 12.2(x) The panel recommended internal moderation of marking for all modules in Part A and that all Part A exam papers are moderated. The recommendation has been noted but has not been put in place 	<p>2. TC/QEO</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC & QEO</p>

<p>for 09/10 because the department will fall in with the Design School procedures for 10/11. Nevertheless the ADT commented that this should still happen. The HoD commented that there are no Part A exams in Semester 1 and he will check and sign all Semester 2 papers.</p> <p>7. 12.1(vii) The panel recommends the department reconsider the use of an electronic system to record meetings with students. The system used in previous years is no longer available, so the department has now started to use Co-Tutor during 09/10. 35% of students currently do not have a Personal Tutor assigned on Co-Tutor. HoD will speak to HoD of the Design School about their Personal Tutoring system.</p> <p>8. 12.2(vi) The panel recommended that students be directed towards the MEC Statistics Advisory Service. Nick Smith currently provides statistics support for Ergonomics students but the department will promote the MEC Statistics Advisory Service and encourage students to use it.</p>	<p>6. HoD</p> <p>7. HoD</p> <p>8. TC</p>
<p>Applications</p> <p>1. UG recruitment is generally difficult and many previous applicants have entered by Change Course offers. Ergonomics must identify itself as a priority department for CCOs.</p> <p>2. UG Psychology with Ergonomics will be replaced by Design Ergonomics and will be marketed alongside the Design and Technology programmes in future.</p> <p>3. PGT recruitment is low and it is difficult to recruit to the targets. The programme is being reviewed. The department will promote the programme via the alumni in future. There is no obvious institution to pair with to form a similar link as the joint China programmes in Materials and School of Mathematics.</p> <p>4. The department felt that the International Office had not done much to help them with international recruitment for the last few years. The ADT will notify Student Recruitment Team.</p>	<p>1. HoD</p> <p>3. TC/Admissions Tutor to consider recruitment initiatives</p> <p>4. ADT</p>
<p>Progression</p> <p>1. <i>Ergonomics</i> Parts A and B progression should be kept under review. There had been problems with some modules that will now be taught 'in-house'. Programme content will be reviewed.</p> <p>2. <i>Psychology with Ergonomics</i> Progression was excellent.</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>TC</p>
<p>Attainment</p> <p>1. UG: good although the External Examiner recommended the department investigate why there are so few 1st class degrees awarded on the UG programmes. This should be kept under review.</p> <p>2. PGT: Overall achievement is excellent.</p>	<p>1. TC</p>
<p>Destinations</p> <p>1. No issues</p>	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <p>1. No major issues, although the department is currently reviewing its feedback procedures.</p>	<p>1. TC</p>
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p>	

1. The 2009 NSS results were encouraging but the department recognizes it needs to be more proactive with students by increasing contact and improving feedback to students.	1. TC
<p>SSLC</p> <p>1. Actions are mostly followed up and recorded but this should be done on every occasion.</p> <p>2. Some issues with the late return of marks on several modules. This should be kept under review.</p> <p>3. Students were very unhappy about the policy of negative marking on HUA251. Student should be made aware of the policy well in advance of any assessments.</p> <p>4. A meeting had been held during 09/10. The minutes will be forwarded to the ADT when completed.</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p>
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>The reports were very positive. Minor issues raised were:</p> <p>1. Prof Jan Noyes: marking of HUP123 (now resolved)</p> <p>2. Prof John Wilson: verbal report contained minor criticisms re projects; written report to be forwarded to ADT.</p>	2. TC
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in the future. A number of areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor Co-Tutor has been recommended as the method to record meetings with students. The Study Skills module requires Part A students to interact regularly with their Personal Tutors. Parts B and C students are required to meet their Personal Tutors at least once per term and staff e-mail students to remind them.</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN Most staff make use of LEARN with only 8% of modules not meeting minimum presence requirements. Every active module has a presence. Some modules exceed the minimum presence requirements to the extent that some students have complained there is too much material for certain modules.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students There are no formal induction procedures for students on Parts B, C or D. Personal tutors request that students meet them at the start of each term but the department recognize it should meet the finalists more frequently.</p> <p>5. Ergonomics education advisory panel A proposal to set up such a panel was welcomed. It was proposed to have this up and running in a couple of years and to consult as widely as possible before implementation. It was agreed that the standard agenda should explicitly include Quality Enhancement</p>	<p>1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR</p> <p>4. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p>

Materials	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>All actions have been completed. The following was noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Postgraduate specifications are completed. UG Materials Engineering specifications have been done. The remaining UG specifications will be completed as soon as possible. 	1. DD
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG UK/EU: The department has to work very hard to reach its target intake and makes significant use of change course offers. Entry qualifications have increased significantly. 2. UK/EU PGT recruitment remains low, although part-time admissions have increased. 3. International PGT recruitment is excellent; the majority of students come via the LMCP programme. 	
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results before SAP continue to be an issue for both Parts A and B. Some Part B results after SAP also cause concern and the department should continue to monitor these. 	1. TC
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UG: generally good. 2. PGT: very good. 	
<p>Destinations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No issues. 	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <p>No major issues. The following comments were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Module feedback for MPP134. Students had asked for more time to be devoted to each subject area. The department is trying to address this without compromising lab time. 2. BEng Materials Engineering. Students complained about bunching of coursework deadlines. The department will monitor this. 3. BSc Design with Engineering Materials. Some students felt they were disadvantaged in materials modules compared to students who specialised in materials and therefore received lower marks. This was linked to their choice of modules and was under review. Extra tutorials had been offered and some restructuring had taken place. The department will monitor this. 4. Exam feedback. Generic feedback is put on LEARN by request. It is not posted automatically. Department should reconsider this. 5. CW feedback will be policed by the General Office staff to ensure that all staff use the green feedback form. It was suggested that the quality of the feedback given should also be checked. 	<p>1. TC, ALC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p>
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The department was placed 3rd in their category in 2009. 2. ‘Assessment and Feedback’ is still the area to improve upon and the department has identified some actions to try and address this. 	
<p>SSLC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There were no serious issues raised. 2. The Department’s responses to all student feedback, not just Module 	2. TC

<p>Feedback, should be an item on every SSC agenda.</p> <p>3. Whenever possible, Programme Directors, or a substitute, should attend SSC meetings.</p> <p>4. Some DIS students had reported that they had not been aware of the assessment criteria for the interim report. Part C students had complained that they had not received DIS work back in good time. Both issues were being addressed.</p>	<p>3. TC & PD's</p> <p>4. TC</p>
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>All reports received were very positive. Minor issues raised were:</p> <p>1. Professor I P Jones: Occasional summation errors had been noticed on exam scripts that should be picked up by the second marker. Moderation procedures are in place and the department will ensure staff follow them.</p> <p>2. Professor H Shercliff:</p> <p>a) Inconsistencies between instructions on a module specification and what was given out to the students. There are now procedures in place to ensure this does not happen.</p> <p>b) Comments on marking practices require staff to be reminded of departmental procedures.</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. TC/Administrator</p> <p>TC/Administrator</p>
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations</p> <p>Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in future. Several areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor</p> <p>Staff use Co-Tutor for meetings with UG personal tutees. UG part-time student attendance is monitored and followed-up. Reminder e-mails are sent to students via Co-Tutor. PGT students have three group tutorials each semester and a register is taken and attendance logged on Co-Tutor</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN</p> <p>There are still a few modules not satisfying the minimum presence requirements.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students</p> <p>Programme tutors do induction sessions in weeks 1 and 2, which give hints and tips. There is an induction session for final year project students and also for DIS students about to go on placement.</p> <p>5. UG Modules</p> <p>'Collection exams' have been introduced in three Part B modules to see if they help students to retain information. The department will evaluate their effectiveness at the end of the academic year.</p> <p>6. Materials laboratory space</p> <p>HoD asked for support from ADT and Faculty in pursuing a solution to the lab space issue, in particular to lend support for a new building / S-building improvements. The department would like to be in the position of being able to run lab sessions without duplication of time and effort.</p>	<p>1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR</p> <p>3. Action TC</p> <p>5. TC</p> <p>6. ADT</p>

Mathematics	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR All actions had been completed. The following additional comments were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3(i) Programme specifications (PPR issue). ILOs have been reviewed with contributions from partner departments in the case of joint degree programmes. Revised programme specs had been submitted to the ADT for approval and were ready to be sent to Marie Kennedy. 3(iv) Student engagement (PPR issue). Statistics were collected during semester 2 of the calculus module to find out if there is a correlation between attendance and performance. There is a clear link but when the issue was discussed at TALC there was no consensus as to the possible cause. There may be some merit in publishing these findings to students and this will be discussed again at the next TALC. The department may want to consider exploring this issue further with the QEO. 	<p>1. JMC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>TC/QEO</p>
<p>Applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall UG recruitment is excellent with increasing entry grades. The mean A-level points score is now 3rd highest in the University. Generally PG UK/EU recruitment remained difficult but PGT International recruitment is increasing. <i>Industrial Mathematical Modelling</i> Intake is small but steady; it attracts mainly UK/EU applicants. There is no funding available from 2010 entry. The bid for KTA funding was unsuccessful so it has been decided not to change or update the programme, as it is unlikely to attract many students without funding. This will be kept under review. <i>Mathematical Processes in Finance</i> Applications and intake have increased; it attracts an increasing number of OS applicants. <i>Mathematics Support for Students with Dyslexia and Dyscalculia in HE/FE</i> This PGCert programme did not run during 08/09. The next intake will begin in February 2010 with approximately 8 students. 	<p>2. RS</p>
<p>Progression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are still some progression issues. Although this is improving, it should still be kept under review. <i>Mathematics with Economics</i> The main issue is with international students who fail the non-mathematics side of the degree programme due to problems with their English. <i>Mathematics and Management</i> Part A progression rates in the summer and Part B progression rates after SAP are both of concern, but are as a result of similar problems in other programmes with a high proportion of international student 	<p>1. Action TC</p>
<p>Attainment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UG: generally good but: <i>Financial Mathematics</i> 	

<p>Part C students were the first cohort and may have experienced some teething issues, which have hopefully been ironed out.</p> <p>2. PGT: Variable</p> <p><i>Industrial Mathematical Modelling</i></p> <p>3 out of 6 required resits</p> <p><i>Mathematical Processes in Finance</i></p> <p>7 out of 16 distinctions; Shandong students do particularly well</p>	
<p>Destinations</p> <p>1. No issues</p>	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <p>1. No major issues</p> <p>2. Feedback to students on coursework and exams is given both individually and generically. Exemplars of good feedback are made available to staff. TALC encourages good practice with regard to feedback, but efforts should be made to monitor this.</p>	2. TC
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <p>1. The 2009 NSS results were disappointing compared with 2008. Two main areas in which the department received lower scores were ‘assessment and marking’ and ‘timetabling issues’. Suggestions to make improvements were submitted to Directorate & PQT.</p>	
<p>SSLC</p> <p>1. The ADT emphasized that three PG meetings should be offered each academic year and UG minutes produced in a timely fashion.</p> <p>2. The minutes from November 2009 UG meeting were missing although a meeting had taken place. Minutes should be forwarded to ADT at earliest opportunity.</p> <p>3. The Department’s responses to all student feedback, not just Module Feedback, should be an item on every SSC agenda.</p> <p>4. The issue of whether UG students are being over-assessed will be discussed in a future review of Parts C and D.</p> <p>5. Concerns had been expressed about the low response rates on some module questionnaires. This was mainly because of low attendance in lectures, which the department is seeking to improve.</p> <p>6. The issue of whether MMath students should attend both UG and PG SSCs needs resolving.</p> <p>7. The issue of the failure of automated confirmation e-mails to students following on-line tests had still not been resolved despite assurances from Martin Hamilton. The ADT agreed to intervene.</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. JMC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>4. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p> <p>6. TC</p> <p>7. ADT</p>
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>All UG reports received were very positive with no serious issues raised. The PGT report had not yet been received.</p>	
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations</p> <p>Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in future. Several areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor</p> <p>There are no issues with the use of Co-Tutor and all staff are encouraged to use it.</p>	1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR

<p>Part A students must engage with their personal tutors during the Calculus and Linear Algebra modules.</p> <p>All PG students are tutored by the programme directors and good relationships develop between staff and students.</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN</p> <p>Most staff make use of LEARN with only 6% of modules not meeting minimum presence requirements.</p> <p>The debate continues between staff and with students about how much material to put on LEARN and how this affects student engagement and attendance.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students</p> <p>There is an induction day for Part A and MSc students.</p> <p>All Personal tutors are expected to meet with their Part C and D students in the first few weeks of semester 1.</p> <p>Programme tutors e-mail all returners with information about the programmes.</p> <p>The department has its own 'returners' web pages.</p> <p>Students are directed towards a FAQs web page that contains lots of useful information and links to other useful pages. The re-registration forms contain a link to returners' information.</p> <p>The above measures have decreased the number of queries from returners in the few weeks before the start of semester one.</p>	<p>3. TC</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

Physics	Actions
<p>Issues raised by last APR / PPR</p> <p>The department submitted a response document to follow-up the previous APR. The following raised by the 2008 PPR were noted:</p> <p>1. 11.2(c)(iv) Review of Programme Specs & Module Specs following PPR</p> <p>The proposed changes are almost complete; any remaining changes will be done via the annual update.</p> <p>There are three Programme Specs not appearing on the Registry web pages, i.e. IT and PH, PH & Cosmology, SS & PH.</p> <p>2. 11.2(c)(v) Review of the high proportion of written exams</p> <p>The department considered this and introduced some group work with further changes under consideration. The ADT advised more changes should be considered as both the IOP and the External Examiners have raised the same issue.</p> <p>3. 11.2(f) Review of condonement policy</p> <p>The department should continue to monitor its use of condonement and to track the future progress of condoned students.</p> <p>4. 11.2(g) Recommendation to refurbish or move to an alternative building</p> <p>The proposed move to Holywell Park now seems unlikely. The department is advised to look for opportunities for funding to carry out refurbishment work. The IOP recommended refurbishment and this evidence should be submitted to support any future funding bid.</p> <p>Other matters arising from the 2009 APR</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>MM to send to Marie Kennedy</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. Action TC</p> <p>4. HoD</p>

<p>5. 4: UG Engineering Physics programme - the issue of non-availability of Engineering modules and timetable clashes continues</p> <p>6. 11: Exam questions should be marked as seen or unseen before being sent out to an External Examiner. The ADT recommended that MM reject any papers that do not confirm to departmental guidelines.</p> <p>7. 13 bullet 2: a high proportion of the UG Physics students that withdraw had progressed from SEFS. The department should introduce stricter progression criteria from SEFS to Physics.</p>	<p>5. TC to monitor</p> <p>6. MM</p> <p>7. TC to liaise with Sandie Dann</p>
<p>Applications</p> <p>1. 2009 UG UK/EU intake for was held back by the University decision not to enter Clearing. The department did receive some financial compensation and wished to use it to refurbish some labs. UG International recruitment remained very low. MPhys numbers are small. A-level points scores increased significantly. Future concessions must be consistent with Faculty standards.</p> <p>2. <i>BSc Physics with/and Management</i>: This programme attracts few applications and intake is very small (zero for 2009). The department should either revise or delete this programme.</p> <p>3. PGT programmes are very small but have increased slightly. The department has modified the first semester and replaced some modules. It is still considering introducing a programme in Econophysics to try to stimulate recruitment.</p>	<p>1. HoD to discuss with Dean</p> <p>Action: Admissions Tutor</p> <p>2. Action TC</p> <p>3. Action TC</p>
<p>Progression</p> <p>1. Parts A & B withdrawal rates are still too high on some UG programmes although rising entry qualifications may help in future. One issue seems to be that students struggle with Maths. The department should keep progression rates under review and ensure there are no other issues with these programmes. It was recommended that the department look at the ILOs and assessment activities to ensure they are appropriate.</p>	<p>1. Action TC</p>
<p>Attainment</p> <p>1. UG: generally good</p> <p>2. PGT: small numbers but no obvious problems</p>	
<p>Destinations</p> <p>1. No issues</p>	
<p>Student feedback – module feedback</p> <p>1. UG programme feedback showed that students wanted staff to make wider use of LEARN. This was also requested in SSC meetings. Staff use of LEARN needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>2. The 3 Loughborough China Physics students felt the programme did not match their expectations most probably due to differences between subjects studied in China and UK Physics degrees. This needs to be looked at.</p> <p>3. Students who took PHD205 without having done the prerequisite module struggled. The ADT suggested that students be dissuaded from taking modules that they are insufficiently prepared for.</p> <p>4. PGT: no issues</p> <p>5. Feedback to students</p> <p>The department’s view was that it was up to the responsible examiner to provide feedback on assessed work. However no one was responsible for checking that feedback is given. The ADT</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>3. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p>

<p>suggested that some quality control was needed and the department consult the QEO for advice.</p>	
<p>Student feedback – NSS</p> <p>1. The department scored well being placed 4th overall. It scored least well on feedback to students and is developing its strategy for feedback and actions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of generic feedback on exams • use of feedback form followed up by talking to individual students. 	
<p>SSLC</p> <p>UG programmes</p> <p>1. The Department’s responses to all student feedback, not just Module Feedback, should be an item on every SSC agenda.</p> <p>2. The action trail through the minutes should be made clearer.</p> <p>3. A general point raised by the students on several occasions was the lack of resources on LEARN. See ‘student feedback’ above.</p> <p>4. There were some comments about Personal Tutor meetings not happening. See ‘Other/Use of Co-Tutor’ below.</p> <p>5. Response to student complaint on one module remained outstanding. All queries should be dealt with in a timely fashion.</p> <p>PG programmes</p> <p>1. None</p>	<p>1. TC</p> <p>2. TC</p> <p>5. TC</p>
<p>External Examiners [Accreditation] – Reports and Departmental responses</p> <p>Reports received were generally positive. Some issues raised were:</p> <p>1. Prof Nigel Hussey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inappropriate spread of marks on some modules ii. Suggested more rigorous marking of common section 1 <p>The ADT noted that the department has considered these suggestions but did not agree; nevertheless he felt that the department should reconsider its marking and moderation procedures further in the light of these comments.</p> <p>Accreditation</p> <p>Following IOP accreditation visit in May 2009 all programmes were awarded conditional accreditation. Suggested changes to meet the IOP conditions had either already been done or would be implemented. A revised proposal will be sent to the IOP. The department should inform the ADT of the outcome.</p> <p>The following items on the accreditation report were discussed further:</p> <p>4. Following the recent changes to the accreditation rules the visiting team have identified some gaps in the curriculum. The department will make the necessary changes to the content and regulations.</p> <p>10. Some of the Cosmology modules appeared to have no pre-requisites and it could not be demonstrated they were at the right level. This will be attended to.</p> <p>11. The ILOs on some of the BSc and MPhys modules needed to be looked at in order that they can be differentiated.</p> <p>16. The assessors requested that the department ensures that questions on the common question 1 on exam papers are not frequently re-used.</p> <p>17. The assessors recommended that the department considers increasing the amount of coursework; they estimate the cw/exam</p>	<p>1. Action HoD/TC</p> <p>2. Action TC</p>

<p>balance to be 'around 10%/90%'. The department is worried about jeopardising academic standards if a higher proportion of coursework is introduced. There are a few modules that are 100% coursework. The department claim the coursework percentage across whole degree programmes averages out around 40%.</p> <p>18. The assessors noted that refurbishment of the labs is needed. The department should use this comment to add weight to any future funding bids for refurbishment.</p> <p>24. The assessors thought that the marking of the projects was over-generous. The department has introduced a new marking scheme for the current academic year.</p>	
<p>Other</p> <p>1. Assessment practice on UG projects and dissertations Caroline Smith had written a summary report of current assessment criteria for projects and dissertation modules. This had been driven by the NSS results and will probably be rolled out to all modules in future. Several areas had been identified for further improvement.</p> <p>2. Use of Co-Tutor Students are expected to meet their Personal Tutor at least once per semester and after their exams. Students are reminded by e-mail. Staff need to be reminded to do this. Staff do keep their own records but only 30% of students have Personal Tutors assigned on Co-Tutor. All staff will be encouraged to use Co-Tutor.</p> <p>3. Use of LEARN 39% of Physics modules did not meet the minimum presence requirements. In light of comments on SSC minutes and in the evaluative feedback the department's use of LEARN should be reviewed. See 'Student Feedback' and SSLC above.</p> <p>4. Induction for Parts B, C & D students There are no formal induction procedures for students beyond Part A. Programme and Personal Tutors e-mail students at various stages to invite them to meetings. A meeting is held with Placement students but not with Project students. The Careers Centre holds a meeting for finalists. The ADT made various suggestions for the department to consider such as induction meetings, returners web pages and FAQs.</p> <p>5. Non-completions The department asked for clarification on the funding implications of student being awarded an earned zero mark.</p> <p>6. MPhys module distribution The department asked for clarification about the distribution of D and P modules allowed on the MPhys programmes, in particular how many D modules may be taken in Part C.</p>	<p>1. TC/QEO to report progress at next APR/PPR</p> <p>2. Action TC Action TC</p> <p>4. TC to consider</p> <p>5. ADT to check</p> <p>6. ADT to confirm</p>

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/February 2010: Chemistry, Computer Science, Ergonomics, Materials, School of Mathematics and Physics.

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

1. Assessment Practice

For this round of APRs, QEO reviewed the current assessment practice within UG project modules. This review focused on the appropriateness and clarity of intending learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment criteria. The number of modules reviewed in this way varied between departments but in all cases, suggestions for improvement to the module specification(s) were made. These suggestions ranged from minor (improvements in presentation/elimination of typographical errors) to major (review intended learning outcomes/formulate assessment criteria for an assessment task).

Action

QEO (Science & Engineering) to liaise with Teaching Co-ordinators and offer support as appropriate with the updating of module specifications and associated resources for UG project modules.

Outcome

Improved module specifications presented to the AD(T) during the annual update process.

2. Induction for Parts B/C/D students

In order to support the work on induction for returners being undertaken by the QEO (SSH), information on induction activities was collated. Departments varied in the scope of their activities for returning students. Ergonomics and Physics provided no structured induction for returners, School of Mathematics and Computer Science have minimal induction (although SoM has a well used FAQ section for returners on its intranet) whilst Chemistry and Materials have organised sessions complemented by effective personal tutoring/year tutor support. Department of Physics was not linked to Registry's "Returners" webpage although other departments were.

Action

QEO (Science & Engineering) to liaise with QEO (SSH) to provide intelligence for current QEO work on induction for returning students.

Outcome

Planned expansion of the current "induction checklist" to include induction for returning students. Work to be completed by the end of the summer term.

3. Feedback to students on assessed work

Departments use a variety of methods to provide feedback to students and monitor the efficacy of this feedback. The following suggestions reflect this mixed practice:

Ergonomics to consider the development of a feedback coversheet for one module in the first instance

Physics to evaluate the assessment/feedback grids used last year and apply any lessons learned

Computer Science to consider expanding the project assessment/feedback software to incorporate other modules

Materials and SoM to audit the quality of feedback received rather than audit the presence/absence of feedback

Chemistry to continue to work with students to promote student engagement with feedback received.

Action

QEO (Science & Engineering) to support staff as required.

Outcome

Dependant on the activity

4. Feedback from students

Departments who hold regular, well attended SSLC meetings are able to canvas opinion from students and work with them on resolving issues. Ensuring that students are aware of changes to practice as a result of their feedback remains a priority – simple naming of an item “changes in response to student feedback” on the SSLC agenda may be beneficial. Specific feedback from students relating to modules was noted:

in Ergonomics, 2 modules previously offered to a mixed cohort will now be reviewed (emphasis on anatomy/physiology reduced) and offered only to ergonomists

in Materials, DIS module attracted some criticism

Action

QEO (Science & Engineering) to meet with:

relevant Responsible Examiners in Ergonomics and offer support with module review as required

DIS Responsible Examiner in Materials and support as required.

Outcome

Dependant on the activity

Caroline Smith

QEO (Science & Engineering)

15.04.10