# Template E2

# Substantive Review Critical Evaluation Document

|  |
| --- |
| **Critical Evalution Document (CED) template** |
| **Course(s):** |
| **Department / School:** |
| **Date of Substantive Review:** |
| **Author / key contact:** |

The CED should provide a comprehensive and coherent evidence-based analysis of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment within courses in the scope of the review, with (where relevant) particular reference to the relevant metrics which triggered the Substantive Review. Wherever possible the CED should refer to the evidence that will be available to the panel, including links where appropriate.

The CED should be:

* Critically reflective
* Open and honest, setting out where support is needed
* Concise
* Constructive
* Forward looking

Please refer to the Course Enhancement Plan (CEP) throughout the CED and indicate where actions have been identified through the CEP in response to issues raised in each section below. The updated CEP should accompany the CED when submitted for the Substantive Review.

The CED does not specify any word limits, but course teams are asked to take a proportional approach in line with the extent of provision under review. There is no expectation that course teams should produce a large volume of material.

**Notes:** Course teams are encouraged to consider the outcomes for different student groups within their course in the context of known awarding gaps. These include the differential attainment/ progression outcomes based on ethnicity, where students from UK domiciled White backgrounds have more successful outcomes compared to UK domiciled students from Black and Asian backgrounds. There are also differentials in outcomes based on disability (students with a registered disability have less successful progression/ attainment outcomes compared to those without a registered disability) and socio-economic background, measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), where students from lower socio-economic backgrounds have fewer positive outcomes than those from higher socio-economic backgrounds. Intersected with these characteristics, commuter students have fewer positive outcomes compared to non-commuting students and students who hold a BTEC qualification have attained less well compared to those who hold other qualifications (such as A levels).

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1**  **Students** |
| Who are your students? Consider the differences outlined above and consider any trends in the composition of your cohort. Describe how the cohort has changed and over what time frame (size, diversity, etc.)  Please consider the following differences within your student cohort and examine the trends within your commentary   * Demographics such as gender, socio-economic background (Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), ethnicity etc.) * First generation to Higher Education * Commuting * Prior qualifications e.g. % of BTEC * Level of prior learning e.g. entry tariffs * Recruitment data |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2**  **Student Outcomes** |
| Consider the outcomes for specific groups of students, particularly as they relate to known sector awarding gaps – Black students compared to White students, mature students compared to young students, students with a declared disability compared to those that have no declared disability, commuting students vs non-commuting students, students with a BTEC compared to those with other qualifications etc.?  Why do you think your different student cohorts are achieving the outcomes they are?  Consider the following measures of success in your student outcomes and examine the trends within your commentary. You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce data tables within your commentary   * Retention * Progression at first attempt * Progression following reassessment * Good Degrees (students awarded a 1st or 2:1, plus Commendation, Distinction or Merit for Integrated Masters) * Degree awarding gaps * Attainment gaps (at module level) * Employability * Graduate Outcomes |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3**  **Student feedback** |
| What are your students saying?Consider trends in the feedback received from students (positive and negative). How has student feedback changed over the last few years? Are you aware of student groups that are less well represented within the feedback?  You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce the data within your commentary   * National Student Survey (NSS) * Student Voice Committees (SVCs) * Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs) * Early Module Reviews (EMRs) * Pulse Surveys * Inclusive Curriculum Consultants Reports |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 4**  **Other feedback** |
| What are other stakeholders saying about the course(s)?  You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce any data within your commentary   * External Examiner feedback * PSRBs * League Tables (Guardian, Times) * Graduate Outcomes Survey |

**\*\*\* Guidance notes: It is important that you respond to the questions in sections 5, 6, and 7 in the light of your analysis above. It is important that your reflections consider the diversity in your cohort and their differential student outcomes \*\*\***

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 5**  **Learning, Teaching and Assessment** |
| What is your current practice?Describe your current learning and teaching, assessment and student engagement and support strategies? Consider their effectiveness in terms of supporting students’ successful outcomes? What is working and what is not working?  You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce any data within your commentary   * Assessment Strategy * Learning and Teaching Strategy (including Learning Technologies) * Employability * Student engagement and support including the Personal Tutorial Scheme and academic support hours * Learning resources |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 6**  **Modules** |
| Consider which modules have successful/ less successful student outcomes. What makes a module successful in your course? Why? What good practice can be identified and disseminated? What is being done to make improvements in modules with less successful outcomes?  You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce within your commentary   * Module Evaluation Plans (MEPs) * Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs) * Module performance dashboards |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 7**  **Staff Development** |
| Are the full Course Team engaged with CPD around developing and improving learning and teaching, assessment and student support and engagement strategies? What support has been arranged or is on-going? What support is needed?  You may wish to refer to the following relevant metrics/information when writing this section, but it is not necessary to reproduce any data within your commentary   * Course Enhancement Plan (CEP) * Continuing Professional Development (CPD) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 8**  **Actions** |
| What actions have already been included in the CEP to address issues raised by the above commentaries? Have any new actions been identified? If it is agreed that changes to the course and/or modules are required, this can be facilitated through the substantive review process, please see note and section 9 below. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action**  (It is not necessary to duplicate existing actions, just state the CEP action number) | **Responsibility** | **Timeframe** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Note: The Substantive Review process can be used to propose course and module changes for consideration and approval by the Substantive Review Panel during the event. Assuming the changes are approved by the panel, there is no further requirement to submit the proposals through the usual University course change procedures

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 9**  **Course and Module Changes** |
| Now that you have reflected on your students’ outcomes and your academic practice, are there any changes that you would like to make to the course(s)? Please summarise your proposals and identify how this will enhance the quality of the student experience. Please submit updated programme specification and/or module descriptors clearly showing the changes made using the track changes feature. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 10**  **Other areas for discussion** |
| *Are there any key areas that you would like the panel to focus on as part of Substantive Review?* |