1. Document Details

Title:	**Policy and Procedure for the Annual Programme Status Review**
Author(s):	Office of the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs / Academic Planning and Review Committee
This Version Number:	1.2
Status:	Approved
Effective Date:	November 2018 [policy positions and outline procedural steps approved Feb. 2012]
Review Date:	November 2019

Important Note: If the 'Status' of this document reads 'Draft', it has not been finalised and should not be relied upon.

2. Revision History

Version Number	Revision Date	Summary of Changes	Changes tracked?
1.2	Nov. 2018	Fully finalised policy integrated in CIT academic policy template with separate Appendix B	
1.1	Dec. 2015	Slightly updated policy and procedure amplified by revised Annual Status Review Template (Memo to AC from the DAQE)	
1.0	Feb. 2012	Initial policy positions and procedural steps as proposed to AC (APRC report)	

3. Relevant/Related Existing Internal Documents

4. Relevant/Related Existing External Documents

5. Consultation History

This document has been prepared in consultation with the following bodies/functions:

6. Approvals

This document requires following approvals (in order where applicable):

Name	Date	Details of Approval Required
Academic Council		Version 1.2 approved by Council on 9 November 2018
Governing Body		

7. Context and Purpose

The Annual Programme Status Review (APSR) is designed to provide a systematic review of programme quality, relevance and viability and to capture ongoing issues and successes related to the design and delivery of a programme thereby supporting decision making and action at local, Faculty/College and Institute level. In particular, the review is intended to:

- Indicate the status of a programme
- Identify issues (both standalone and recurring)
- Identify programme improvements, successes and achievements
- Provide information leading to the identification of Faculty/College-wide and Institute-wide issues
- Provide data and statistics for other reviews e.g. programmatic review

While it is an objective of the review to identify and report issues and problems, the process for resolving these issues is not part of the review. Instead issues identified should be addressed via the normal management structures, activities and processes of the Institute.

8. Scope

All taught programmes at NFQ levels 6 to 9.

9. Exclusions

Programmes delivered exclusively by research.

10. Policy

10.1 Procedure Overview

The Annual Programme Status Review consists of two distinct phases:

1. Review and Report
2. Follow-up

Phase 1: Review and Report
The Programme Board should conduct a review of the programme and should report the outcome of this review under three headings:

A. Key Indicators of Programme Status

- Applications and 1st preferences
- Enrolments
- Retention
- Student achievement (e.g. % 1st & 2.1/Distinction & Merit)
- Graduate achievement (e.g. % in relevant employment/further study)

B. Results of Stakeholder Consultation

The views and suggestions of the various groups of stakeholders i.e. students, staff, external examiners, graduates and employers should be sought recorded and presented.

C. Analysis

Drawing on the review data and appropriate benchmark data as well as on the operational issues and improvements/achievements which have come to the attention of the programme board via the normal programme management and delivery activities (e.g. examination boards, programme board meetings, external examiner reports, etc.), the report should record and address:

- • Improvements and achievements
- • Issues and concerns
- • Recommendations

A sample Programme Status Review Report template for a CAO programme with samples of 'pre-loaded' key programme indicators is provided in Appendix B (*separate document*). Associated data definitions can be found in Appendix A (attached).

Phase 2: Follow-up

As stated above, this procedure does not address in detail the means of resolving the issues and problems identified by the review. Follow-up on the issues identified in the report should take place at three distinct levels:

1. Department/School Follow-up
2. Faculty/College Follow-up
3. Academic Council Follow-up

Department /School Follow-up

As the units primarily responsible for the delivery of individual programmes, the academic departments and schools retain ownership of the process for following up on the issues identified during the annual programme review. Follow-up actions should be implemented via the normal management structures, activities and processes of the Institute.

The Head of Department/Head of School should, as part of his/her normal programme management duties, seek resolution for the issues identified in the annual programme review report. The programme board should be informed (by means of periodic reports from the Head of Department to the Programme Board) of what actions have been taken.

Faculty/College Level Follow-up

All relevant Annual Programme Status Review reports should be considered at a single meeting of the Faculty/College Board of Studies. This meeting should seek to identify issues and problems which are Faculty/College-Wide and should analyse these issues.

A single Faculty/College report should be compiled following this meeting and this report should be forwarded for consideration by Academic Council. The Faculty/College report should also be forwarded for formal consideration by the Institute Executive Board (IEB). This Faculty/College report should be accompanied by all of the individual programme reports. The Faculty/College report should:

1. Identify Faculty/College-wide issues (i.e. improvements, achievements and problems)
2. Analyse these issues to determine possible benefits, impacts and causes

Following on from this, the Faculty/College should put in train the processes required to act on these issues as appropriate.

Academic Council Follow-up

The Academic Planning and Review Committee (APRC) should review the Faculty/College reports (and the accompanying programme reports) on behalf of the Academic Council. The review by the APRC should seek to identify Institute-wide issues and should analyse these issues. The APRC may refer to the programme reports, as well as the Faculty/College reports, as part of the process of analysing the issues identified. The APRC will produce a single annual report for Academic Council and this report should:

1. Identify Institute-wide issues (i.e. improvements, achievements and problems)
2. Analyse these issues to determine possible benefits, impacts and causes

The Academic Council should consider this report, discuss the issues identified and if deemed appropriate or necessary put in train the process or processes required to address these issues.

10.2 Procedural Steps and Actions

Assumptions

By necessity, the procedural flow set out hereunder assumes certain givens. Without these, the process will not fully function as intended, and its benefits for programme planning, management and quality enhancement purposes cannot be fully realised. These givens are:

- Adequate MIS and reporting facilities and workflows are in place both centrally and at the level of individual Departments / Programme Boards, as appropriate, to enable adequate gathering and presentation of all the relevant data.
- A properly constituted Programme Board is assigned to each programme and is operating as intended.
- Analysis and discussion of the annual programme review reports forms a standing agenda item for the Faculty/College Boards of Study, with appropriate reporting mechanisms to Academic Council and the IEB, as appropriate, in place.
- Analysis and discussion of the Faculty/College summary reports forms a standing agenda item of the Academic Planning and Review Committee of Academic Council.

Procedure

Procedure	Responsibility	Timeline
1. Programme Performance Data		
1.1 Data sets for the programme relating to the key programme indications are presented in an appropriate format.	MIS/Banner	September/ October
1.2 Stakeholders are consulted or surveyed and their responses are collated.	Head of Department	September/ October

2. Programme Review		
2.1 The programme board meets to consider the programme performance data. The data is analysed with a view to identifying: • Improvements and achievements • Issues and concerns • Recommendations	Programme Coordinator	November
2.2 The annual programme status review report is created using the standard template. This report contains the programme performance data and the outcome of the programme review.	Programme Coordinator	November
2.3 The report is sent to the Head of Department, Head of School and the Head of Faculty/College.	Head of Department	November
3. Faculty/College Review of Programmes		
3.1 The Faculty/College Board of Studies (or the appropriate sub-committee of same) will meet to consider all the annual programme status review reports. The review will seek to: • Identify Faculty/College-wide issues (i.e. improvements, achievements and problems) • Analyse these issues to determine possible benefits, impacts and causes	Head of Faculty/College	December
3.2 A Faculty/College Review of Programmes report will be completed using the standard template. This report is sent to the Registrar's Office for consideration by Academic Council. It should also be sent to the President's Office for consideration by the IEB.	Head of Faculty/College	December
4. Academic Council Review of Programmes		
4.1 The Academic Planning and Review Committee (APRC) will review, on behalf of the Academic Council, each of the Faculty/College review of programmes reports. The review will seek to: • Identify Institute-wide issues (i.e. improvements, achievements and problems) • Analyse these issues to determine possible benefits, impacts and causes	Chair of APRC	January/ February
4.2 Arising out of this review the APRC will prepare a review of programmes report for Academic Council.	Chair of APRC	January/ February
4.3 Once per academic year the Academic Council will conduct a review of programmes by considering the relevant APRC report.	Registrar	March/ April

Appendix A: Data Definitions

The data definitions hereunder align with the usage of all relevant external agencies, including the HEA and QQI.

When analysing and reporting on the status of programmes, all relevant parties should ensure the consistency of the terms and concepts used in the reports with the definitions below to ensure the findings and observations are sufficiently comparable across all Institute areas.

Data Label	Data Definition	Notes
Department	The department of the student's primary enrolment	
Programme	Programme of primary enrolment. Students attending more than one programme, or more than one stage of a programme, are counted just once in an academic year, and reported only in association with their primary programme stage enrolment in that year.	
Enrolments	Count of primary enrolments on November 1. Where the academic year is used to filter or group, this is implicitly a count of students, as a student has just one primary enrolment in a given academic year.	Note that when reporting on Student numbers the label 'Enrolments' will be used instead of 'Registrations'
Withdrawn	Students who withdraw from a programme.	
Deferred	Students who defer an academic year of a programme.	
Accepted	Students who accept an offer of a place on a programme in CIT	
ERASMUS (In)	Incoming ERASMUS students enrolled on a programme in CIT	
Accepted /Never Registered (No Shows)?	These are students who accept an offer of a place on a programme but never register for that programme.	
Academic Year	Academic Year of the Primary Enrolment	
Stage	A stage refers to portion of a programme that requires academic assessment to progress. It is associated with an academic standing. Note that the label 'Stage 1' is preferred to the label 'Year 1'	
CAO Applications	Applications for a place on this programme via the CAO	

CAO Preferences	1st, 2nd or 3rd: Count of students who marked this programme as their 1st, 2nd or 3rd preference in their CAO application Total(1-10): Count of students who marked this programme with any preference from 1 to 10 in their CAO application	Data is recorded after the closing date of the CAO's final 'Change of Mind'
Intake	Count of new students enrolled on stage 1 of a programme on November 1.	This definition is specific to Stage 1. It takes no account of new intake into CIT in subsequent stages by for example on Advanced Entry.
Gender	Gender of student	
Entry Route	This describes the application entry route of students	e.g CAO or Non-CAO
CAO	In this context 'CAO' refers to the count of students whose application came via the CAO.	This count will also include students on HEAR / DARE schemes, zero CAO points who applied via the CAO.
Non-CAO	In this context 'Non-CAO' refers to the count of students whose application did not come via the CAO.	
Min CAO Points Mean CAO Points Max CAO Points	Programme Entry Points statistics for students with 'Standard' CAO entry ratings (see below).	These stats include students who receive a place with reduced CAO points. Note that Min CAO Points is not a reliable measure of Final CAO Cutoff points.
First Time (Stage)	Count of students enrolled on this programme for the first time.	
Repeats (Stage)	Count of students enrolled on this programme who are repeating this stage. This includes students who are repeating both by re-attendance and by exam only.	
Student Progression	In this context this refers to the student's eligibility to progress to the next stage of this programme based on their Academic Standing.	
Eligible to Progress	The Academic Standing of student is one of: (DIS/H1, MER1/H21, MER2/H22 or PASS/CO)	
May not Progress	Academic Standing of student is NOT one of: (DIS/H1, MER1/H21, MER2/H22 or PASS/CO)	
Passed (Stage)	Academic Standing of student is one of: (DIS/H1, MER1/H21, MER2/H22 or PASS)	Note that Progress with Credits Outstanding are NOT included

CO	Academic Standing of student is Progress with Credits Outstanding	
Student Progression %	(#students 'Eligible to Progress')/(#enrolled students on Nov 1)	
Module Results (Final)	<u>Final</u> mark recorded on a module for a student. (i.e Summer and Autumn combined)	
First Time (module)	Count of students enrolled on this module for the first time.	
Repeats (module)	Count of students enrolled on this module who are repeating either by exam only or by reattendance.	Note that this does not include students who are repeating a module from this stage as a CO who have progressed into the next stage. This will be reported in the next stage.
Sat Exam	Count of students where there are marks recorded for this module.	This definition is used in an effort to quantify how many enrolled students actually 'made an attempt' in the module.
%pass of enrolled	(#students who passed module)/(#students enrolled on the module) Numerator excludes students who passed by compensation and includes students who received an Exemption	
Mean (Module Results)	Arithmetic mean of marks received by students for this module (where there marks recorded)	
SD (Module Results)	Standard Deviation of marks received by students for this module (where there marks recorded)	
%pass of sat	(#students who passed module)/(#students enrolled on modules who 'sat' the assessments)	This calculation excludes students who withdrew from or deferred the module.
Awards	An award which is conferred on a student which records that the student has acquired a standard of knowledge, skill or competence.	
Awards %	(#students who received a particular Award Result)/(#students who received an Award)	