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**Annual Programme Review**

The Annual Programme Review (APR) is a core evaluation process for the quality assurance and enhancement of learning, teaching and assessment at the University of Malta. The University requires each Faculty/Institute/Centre and School (FICS) to conduct an annual review of its undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. This process is complemented by a more thorough Periodic Programme Review which is performed every five to six years as part of the University’s ongoing monitoring and review of programmes.

The APR is a light touch evaluation process designed to:

* provide an opportunity for reviewing and enhancing the quality of the student learning and teaching experience while assuring academic standards and quality;
* encourage and support critical reflection;
* promote professional dialogue with a specific focus on enhancement;
* identify good practice for dissemination within the University and beyond.

Each FICS compiles an annual evaluation APR template which makes reference to a number of study-units delivered in each year of the programmes running during that particular academic year. The APR template is submitted to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) through the Quality Support Unit (QSU). The APR template is to be also submitted to the Programme Validation Committee (PVC) through the Academic Programmes Quality and Resources Unit (APQRU) in cases where revisions to existing programmes of study or changes to existing study-units are being proposed following review of the programme. As a result of the APR, the FICS will be able to identify areas for improvement, plan achievable actions for continuous enhancement and highlight good practices.

The APR ensures that the University regularly and consistently reflects on the learning, teaching and assessment of programmes and how these are impacting on the students’ higher education experience. This process is essential in supporting the University as it endeavours to meet the National Quality Assurance Framework for Further and Higher Education in Malta as required by Subsidiary Legislation 607.03 and the European Standards and Guidelines (2015). Furthermore, it is a key characteristic of the University of Malta’s commitment to continuously enhance the quality of its educational provision and to permeate a culture of quality among all members of its community.

Outline of the APR Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| October - September (from beginning to end of academic year) | Throughout the academic year, FICS monitor delivery of programmes through mechanisms such as student feedback, external examiners’ reports, boards of studies’ discussions, other contributions from internal and external stakeholders etc. |
| September - December | Analyse data and report outcomes in the Annual Programme Review (APR) template. Deadline for submission of the APR template to QAC will be the end of December. |
| June | QAC identifies common themes arising from the APR templates and presents a summary report to the Senate along with identified good practices and dissemination to FICS before the start of the following academic year. |

**Annual Programme Review (APR)Template**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic year under review:** |  |
| **Programme under review:** |  |
| **Name of person (s) submitting the APR:** |  |
| **Role:** |  |
| **Faculty/Institute/Centre/School:** |  |
| **Programme Review team involvement:**  *(Indicate who has worked on the APR, such as the Board of Studies and list the members. QAC recommends that the APR template is compiled by the Board of Studies however this does not preclude FICS from establishing an ad hoc Board specifically for this purpose if deemed necessary)* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Action points addressed from the previous Annual or Periodic Programme Review (APR or PPR). FICS that have completed a PPR in the previous academic year can use the recommendations in that report for this purpose.** | | |
| Recommendations from previous APR or PPR *(list and insert rows as applicable)* | Action taken | Implementation date |
| 1. |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Outcomes of student feedback** *(at least 50% of the study-units per programme per academic year need to be taken into consideration for this section i.e each lecturer/HoD/programme coordinator needs to collect feedback for at least 50% of the study-units per programme per year. This will lead to 100% of the study-units per programme per year being evaluated within two academic years[[1]](#footnote-1). The BoS lists the key points emerging from the analysis of the feedback collected in the table below).* | |
| 1. Study-unit feedback emerging from the exercise conducted by APQRU and/or other feedback mechanisms adopted at FICS/departmental/lecturer level (*such as in class feedback, questionnaires – link to student feedback policy*). | |
| Programme Code & Name |  |
| Please list the study-units which were included for evaluation. List the study-unit codes and names. (*Add more rows as necessary*.) | 1. |
| 2. |
| Identified strengths | 1. |
| 2. |
| Identified areas for enhancement | 1. |
| 2. |
| Issues of concern | 1. |
| 2. |
| 1. End-of-programme feedback as conducted by APQRU or any other FICS-led initiatives | |
| Title of Award (including area of study if applicable) |  |
| Identified strengths | 1. |
| 2. |
| Identified areas for enhancement | 1. |
| 2. |
| Issues of concern | 1. |
| 2. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Recommendations made by student representatives during Board of Studies or FICS Board meetings** | | |
| Substantive recommendation/s *(please list & add rows as applicable)* | Action/decision taken | Implementation date |
| 1. |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please indicate how the students on the programme were informed about the actions taken following their feedback (max. 150 words). |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Staff feedback on Programme of Studies** | |
| What were the major points to be considered from the review of study-units?  **What is working well?** *Please provide 2-3 concrete examples of good practice (including, where applicable, an indication of their alignment with the UM strategy), that can be shared with colleagues across the University.* [max 150 words] |  |
| What areas would you like to improve? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Key points emerging from the reports of external examiners (where applicable)** | |
| Identified strengths | 1. |
| 2. |
| Identified areas for enhancement | 1. |
| 2. |
| Issues of concern | 1. |
| 2. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Key Performance Indicators on Student Data** | |
| **Student Admission Metrics (*for the previous academic year*)** | |
| **Number of new applications** |  |
| **Number of accepted applications** |  |
| Percentage of applicants who were accepted |  |
| Was there a change in the number of applicants and if so by how much from the previous year? (*analysing the trend would be helpful*). |  |
| **Age (range and average) of students on entry)** |  |
| **Gender (F, M, other)** |  |
| **Geographical Location (by region)** |  |
| **Number of Full-time/part-time students** |  |
| **Number of Students declaring a disability** |  |
| **Graduation Metrics** | |
| **Degrees Conferred** |  |
| **Classifications Conferred** |  |
| **Graduation rate on time** *(without suspensions, extensions & repeat years)* |  |
| **Gender** |  |
| **Geographical Location (by region)** |  |
| **Retention Metrics** | |
| **Percentage of students requesting suspension** |  |
| **Percentage of undergraduate students requesting extension year** |  |
| **Percentage of students repeating a year or more** |  |
| **Percentage of student drop-outs** |  |
| **Percentage of students changing course** |  |
| **Percentage of students withdrawing from course** |  |
| **Distribution of Grades** *(Optional - this field is not obligatory and its calculation is not available through Microsoft Power BI. Consider only if your FICS already generates this data. It could be beneficial for the APR.)* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Changes to the Programme of Study** | |
| Indicate what changes are proposed in relation to this APR. (*Include any changes in study-unit components and/or assessment*). | |
| Proposed Change | Major or Minor |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| Indicate any other required actions planned as a result of this APR | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please provide some reflections on the main challenges the FICS faced in terms of teaching, learning and assessment. *What additional support will be useful going forward?* [max 150 words]** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please add below any additional suggestions that would improve this programme of study.** |
|  |

1. *Lecturers will be informed by the end of October whether the study-units they deliver have been tagged by evaluation by APQRU.**Similarly, study-unit lecturers are to be informed by the programme co-ordinator, by the end of November, whether their unit has been selected for FICS-led evaluation purposes for the APR of the particular academic year.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)