Appendix 2 to the minute of meeting
№ 6 of TSUL Council dated
November 1, 2024

Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review Policy of Tashkent State University of Law

Amendments made to this Policy:
Appendix 1 to Minutes No. 3 of the TSUL Council meeting dated September 11, 2026

This Policy is in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan on education and the resolutions of the Board of Trustees of Tashkent State University of Law, related to ensuring quality assurance at the university and the Quality Assurance Policy of Tashkent State University of Law. The policy governs relationships on the University's annual monitoring and periodic review arrangements.

The Policy is developed in compliance with international standards and guidelines for quality assurance in higher education, emphasizing the importance of effective institutional mechanisms for regular and periodic review of academic provision and support services.

Chapter I. General Rules

1. The Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review Policy (hereinafter – Policy) of Tashkent State University of Law (hereinafter – TSUL) is a component of the TSUL Academic Quality Framework. This Policy outlines the principles of, and procedures for annual monitoring and periodic review.

2. Annual monitoring and periodic review at TSUL have such a dual purpose as to identify good practice worthy of dissemination across the University and to identify local and thematic areas in need of further development to assure and enhance standards and the quality of the student experience.

3. In order to enhance quality and standards, the University is committed to the effective capture and dissemination of good practice in learning, teaching, assessment, research, innovation and support services. In their entirety, annual monitoring and periodic review offer a supportive and developmental system of review, reflection, and enhancement, through effective sharing of such good practice and timely, collaborative action planning. They also allow for the early identification of shortfalls in performance against the University's strategic objectives, and for appropriate action to be taken.

4. This Policy provides a comprehensive structure for consistently capturing and recognizing excellence at all levels, for sharing that effectively, and for understanding the impact of the good practice. TSUL aspires to use data collegially and intelligently to inspire different ways of working, enabling staff and students to make decisions that make a positive impact on Tashkent State University of Law student experience.

The Policy also provides a framework for the systematic identification of areas for further development, in particular, through the data-led approaches and embedded presence of student engagement within TSUL monitoring and review processes.

5. The policy incorporates all credit and award-bearing academic taught and research degree provision, including undergraduate programmes, postgraduate taught programmes and postgraduate research degrees.

Chapter II. Definitions

6. The following terms and abbreviations are used in this Policy:

Reflection: the process of deep consideration regarding the effectiveness of academic programs and administrative departments, through which faculty and staff can reach evidence-based conclusions based on data analysis.

Annual Monitoring (AM): the ongoing, systematic process of reviewing and reflecting on the quality of academic programmes and administrative departments to ensure continuous improvement.

Annual Monitoring Report (AMR): A report that provides in-depth review of individual programmes or service departments, including student performance (for academic programmes), strategic alignment, stakeholder feedback, and recommendations for improvement.

Periodic Review (PR): a key component of the TSUL Academic Quality Framework, periodic review helps to assure the quality of the student learning experience and identifies opportunities for enhancement. It operates on a five-year cycle and involves a panel of peers reviewing individual academic programmes.

Periodic Review Panel (PRP): Periodic Review Panels are formally constituted panels of peers, including at least one student and external academic, who collegially review academic programmes of study, leading to the production of a report containing identified good practice and recommendations.

Quality Assurance Committee (QAC): The University's Quality Assurance Committee comprises a wide range of University departments and key stakeholders (including academics and students) to ensure the university develops

and consistently implements quality assurance policies and processes that ensure the institution delivers the highest quality teaching, learning and support.

Pathway Leader of the Programme: a member of academic staff who is assigned leadership responsibility for a curriculum pathway on the Bachelor's Degree in Jurisprudence. **Pathway Leaders of the Programme** (hereinafter – Pathway Leader) are responsible for ensuring effective and coherent delivery of each pathway and for undertaking monitoring and review activities.

Pathway leaders are accountable to the relevant Dean.

Programme Leader: a member of academic staff who is assigned leadership responsibility for bachelor's programmes (excluding the Bachelor's Degree in Jurisprudence) and postgraduate programmes. Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring effective and coherent delivery of each programme and for undertaking monitoring and review activities.

Programme leaders of the postgraduate programmes are accountable to the Dean.

Programme leaders of the postgraduate research programmes are accountable to the Head of Scientific Department.

Programme Team: comprises the wider group of staff involved in the delivery of academic pathways and programmes who, under the leadership of the either a Pathway or Programme Leader, make a contribution to quality assurance processes and procedures, for example by supporting production of the annual monitoring report or self-evaluation report for periodic review.

Chapter III. Principles of Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review

7. The university relies on the following principles for its annual monitoring and periodic review:

Data-informed: A core data set will be used to evaluate quality and achievement against University strategy and to drive enhancement. Core data will be complemented by consideration of qualitative information at programme level. Robust data provides us with a starting point for asking the right questions, enabling us to react quickly, and collectively understand and improve our performance over time.

Transparent: The processes at TSUL are underpinned by intelligent use of shared information that is accessible to all relevant staff. Effective sharing of information enables the collective identification and prioritization of actions to be taken to address problems and drive continuous improvement.

Timely: Careful and routine analysis of data as it becomes available, as well as at specified points in the academic cycle, will support the early identification of risk, and early intervention.

Self-reflective: Individual staff and academic units (e.g. programmes, departments and faculties) embrace feedback and constructive criticism and engage in detailed analysis in order to enhance their academic practice and provision.

Action-focused: Where performance against strategic objectives needs to be improved, the process will clearly identify the actions that need to be taken, by whom, and within what timescale, to ensure the quality of the provision and the student experience going forward.

Inclusive: Through timely engagement with data, and through appropriate partnership with students, enhancement activities will reflect the university's commitment to ensuring that all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in, and benefit from, their university education. Annual monitoring activity, and the targeted actions arising from it, will identify and seek to address gaps in attainment for students with particular demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age and so on).

Students engagement is embedded into the University's monitoring and review procedures most significantly through the feedback they provide that informs our approach. But also by serving on periodic review panels and meeting the panel during the visit as a key stakeholder.

Chapter IV. Annual Monitoring

8. Annual monitoring at TSUL is centered on the production and consideration of Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs). There are two principle forms of AMR such as AMRs of Academic Programmes and AMRs of Administrative Departments.

This approach ensures that all University activity that has a demonstrable impact on the quality of the student experience is subject to annual monitoring, namely, students' taught and research programmes and services responsible for providing support to the student learning experience, either directly or indirectly (e.g. departments providing pedagogical or administrative support for staff).

9. **AMRs of Academic Programmes.** Academic colleagues are expected to engage with data provided throughout the year to review modules and programmes, including research degrees. This data is used as the basis for constructing the Annual Monitoring Reports, using the approved University template (see Appendix 1).

10. AMRs should be constructed by the Pathway or Programme leader and include involvement from the wider programme team and staff teaching on a programme's modules as part of the process.

11. AMRs should then be considered at Section and Faculty level, including by Faculty Councils, before being formally submitted to the Quality Assurance Department (QAD).

12. The QAD will review all AMRs of academic programmes submitted across the institution to 1) ensure compliance with the process and 2) produce a summary report for consideration by University Council, that identifies good practice and any thematic areas for development. University Council will discuss any identified themes and approve the conclusion of the annual monitoring cycle each academic year based on the summary report provided by QAD.

13. **AMRs of Administrative Departments.** Staff leading administrative departments are expected to engage with data provided throughout the year to review the quality of support provided by the department. This data is used as the basis for constructing the Annual Monitoring Reports, using the approved University template (see Appendix 2).

14. AMRs should be constructed by the Head of Department and include relevant departmental staff as part of the process. AMRs should then be considered at department level, before being formally submitted to the Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning.

15. The Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning will review all AMRs of administrative departments submitted across the institution to 1) ensure compliance with the process and 2) produce a summary report for consideration by University Council, that identifies good practice and/or any thematic areas for development . University Council will discuss any identified themes and sign-off the annual monitoring cycle each academic year based on the summary report provided by the Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning.

16. There are 7 stages to the AMR process that are common to academic programmes and administrative departments. They are as follows:

Stage 1. Using available data and Data Sent to Academic Programmes and Administrative Departments (Data is used soon as it is available. For assessment data, this will be by the end of September):

The initial stage involves gathering data. For academic programmes, this data will include student performance metrics, feedback, evaluations of taught programmes, etc. Programme teams should make use of data they already have access to (for example survey's conducted by the programme team themselves or direct feedback received by students)

For administrative departments it will include usage data (i.e. the number of students accessing particular administrative departments and services), demographic analysis and student feedback etc. Administrative departments should make use of the data they already have access to.

The data on assessment results and student performance metrics is sent it to the academic programme team and administrative departments by the end of September by the Registrar's Office.

Stage 2. Programme/Department Leadership reflects on data:

The Pathway/Programme Leader and programme team or administrative department analyses and reflects on the data to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities for improvement, and any emerging issues. This should be an iterative process commencing at the end of the academic year and refined when assessment data is available.

Stage 3. Programme/Department Leadership constructs AMR (Annual Monitoring Report):

The Pathway/Programme Leader and programme team or administrative department compiles their findings into the relevant Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) template, which provides an overview of the programme or department's performance and identifies key areas for development.

Stage 4. Programme/Department Leadership ensures AMR contains SMART actions:

The AMR is refined to include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) actions, ensuring that the plans for improvement are clear and actionable.

Stage 5. AMR submitted to either the Quality Assurance Department or Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning (10th October):

Once finalized, the AMRs are submitted to the Quality Assurance Department by deans and High School of Legal Research (academic programmes) or Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning (administrative departments) for review and oversight, ensuring compliance with university standards.

The programme team or administrative department propose deadlines for actions when submitting the AMR. The Quality Assurance Department, Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning my require changes to these deadlines where they view them to be too long or short respectively.

Stage 6. Quality Assurance Department and Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning produce summary reports for University Council (20th October):

The Quality Assurance Department and Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning compile summary reports based on all AMRs received, providing a comprehensive overview of the university's academic and administrative performance.

Stage 7. University Council Signs Off the Annual Monitoring Cycle for That Year (Next University Council Meeting):

University Council reviews and approves the summary reports, ensuring they align with institutional goals and strategic objectives. Finally, the University Council approves the conclusion of that the process, officially closing the annual monitoring loop for that year's cycle.

17. Annual monitoring ensures that the university engages in a comprehensive and robust reflective exercise at a specified period in the academic cycle.

However, the university firmly expects that all staff will engage with data on a regular basis, taking timely action wherever necessary and not waiting unduly to include areas for development in an AMR when they can be resolved more expeditiously.

Chapter V. Periodic Review

18. Periodic Review (hereinafter - PR) ensures that standards and academic quality in the University remain at an appropriate level and assists the Faculty in demonstrating that their programmes meet these standards.

PR assures the quality of learning and teaching, drawing on critical appraisal by external and peer reviewers, self-evaluation, and stakeholder feedback, including from students, employers and alumni.

It evaluates the cumulative impact of revisions to programmes resulting from the Annual Monitoring process. PR is a supportive, constructive critical evaluation that provides recommendations on improving academic programmes within the University. It enables faculty members, heads of department, and university administration to reflect on their practices to identify and address areas for improvement.

19. PR will be conducted consistently and systematically across the University according to the mechanisms outlined in this Policy. Programmes must undergo Periodic Review at least every 5 years.

The aims of PR are to:

ensure that the quality of learning and teaching is appropriate and compliant with recognized international and state standards and policies;

verify that successful students attain programme learning outcomes;

provide evidence that, where appropriate, students are involved in research activities and that research is integrated into teaching;

review the profile of teaching staff;

assess the adequacy of budget and sufficiency of resources for each programme;

confirm that appropriate student academic support services are provided;

review the data on student admission to programmes, progression, retention, student satisfaction and graduate destinations (these form part of the core data set);

identify innovations, best practices, and opportunities for further enhancement.

20. The members of review panel and the schedule for PR will be through liaison with Quality Assurance Department, considering Faculty requirements, including any anticipated external programme accreditations, and other commitments. The membership of the review panel and the date of review will be confirmed through the Rector's order at least six months in advance and made available to the Faculty concerned.

21. Deans are responsible for overseeing PR within their Faculty.

22. PR consists of the following stages:

Preparatory phase;

Self-evaluation phase;

PRP Visit;

Response of the reviewed Department to the draft PRP report;

Approval of the report and action plan;

Implementation of the program action plan and report recommendations.

23. **Preparatory phase.** A Self-Evaluation Working Group is established under the leadership of the relevant Dean or the Head of Scientific Department.

A preliminary meeting of the working group is held to confirm the review timeline and determine the key actions required and assign responsibilities.

A PRP membership should be based on competence and experience, with conflicts of interest being excluded. It will consist of the following members:

A Dean from another TSUL Faculty appointed as chair of the panel by the QAD;

two faculty members with strong research and academic portfolios, one of whom should be proposed by the Quality Assurance Committee and one of whom should be recommended by the Faculty Council. The QAD independently develops the selection criteria and selects the appropriate candidates, preventing any possible conflict of interests and adhering to the principles of transparency and impartiality;

an undergraduate and/or postgraduate student representative (the student panel member should not be enrolled in the programme under review) proposed by the Student Association or Young Scholars Council;

at least one external academic reviewer (not from a strategic partner), who possess(es) expertise in the subject areas;

at least one external industry reviewer (not from a strategic partner), who possess(es) expertise in the subject areas.

24. **Self-evaluation phase.** A self-evaluation report (SER) is prepared by the Self-Evaluation Working Group. The Quality Assurance Department will provide guidance for staff responsible for developing the SER. The working group may wish to employ a SWOT or other analytical device as part of their self-evaluation. Relevant evidence should complement the SER given to the PRP, so that they can gain a clear understanding of the context, especially for external stakeholders.

At least six weeks prior to the PRP visit, the Dean approves the report and sends it to the QAD.

The QAD reviews the report for completeness and alignment with the PR policy and, once satisfied, forwards it to the PRP.

The PRP reviews the self-evaluation report within a period of one month and highlights areas of focus for the PRP visit. Additional documents may be requested from the Faculty deans or programme leader by the PRP at this stage.

25. **PRP Visit and Report.** The PRP visit is arranged by the reviewed Faculty, which provides the required information for the PRP.

The visit will typically last one day, except in instances where the panel is considering multiple programmes.

During the PRP visit, the panel focuses on academic quality assurance and continuous improvement, curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment, faculty resources, student support, and other aspects relevant to delivery of the academic programme and maintaining a high-quality student experience.

The visit will, typically, include meetings with faculty members, administrators, students, including the ones from section-students and faculty-students committees, industrial representatives and class observations.

Within one month of the visit, the PRP prepares a draft report containing the conclusions it has drawn from the visit, the programme's self-evaluation report and its action plan. The report contains conditions, recommendations and good practice for the programme to address.

The Periodic Review Panel will determine the deadline for any conditions or recommendations.

26. **Response of the programme team to the draft PRP report.** Within one month of receiving the draft report the programme team prepares a response to the issues raised in the PRP report and an action plan. This includes an opportunity to correct factual errors.

The Faculty Dean approves the response and forwards it to the PRP.

27. **Approval of the report and action plan.**

Within 15 working days of receiving the programme team's response, the PRP finalizes its report and forwards it to QAD for consideration. When QAD is satisfied that all requirements have been satisfied (could be pre)it submits the report and action plan to University Council for final approval.

28. **Implementation of the Programme's action plan and report recommendations.**

Following University Council approval, the programme team and the Faculty Deans must ensure that any recommendation contained in the action plan are addressed in the specified timeframe. Progress with the actions must be commented on in Annual Monitoring Reports during this period to ensure an integrated approach between annual monitoring and periodic review.

Chapter VI. Concluding rules

29. Regarding issues related to this policy and its implementation, the Quality Assurance Department can be contacted.

30. The policy is reviewed according to the established procedure and, if necessary, relevant amendments and additions are made.

The Quality Assurance Department is responsible for the organizational aspect of the review of the policy.

The Quality Assurance Committee will discuss any amendments to this policy before the University Council.

Annex 1: TSUL Programme Annual Monitoring Report Template

TSUL Programme Annual Monitoring Report Template

Scope: All programmes, **taught** and **research**, must be monitored annually and reports provided to the Quality Assurance Department in time to inform the development of an institutional summary that will be submitted to University Council.

Length: Your report should be concise (see word count guidance in each reporting box) and use bullet points where possible. The intention is that Pathway/Programme leaders and programme teams identify the important and salient points needed to enhance the programme and contribute to the identification of institutional and localized good practice and areas for development.

Data: Your report should include reflection on relevant data, such as: student demographic data, admission, progression, retention, attrition and withdrawal data. It should also consider student grades and assessment results, quantitative and qualitative student satisfaction data and graduate outcomes data. Where available, it should also consider the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) from the previous year. Specifically, you should comment on how any good practice has been disseminated and how are actions have been addressed.

The annual monitoring of a joint education programme also uses data related to the academic performance of students studying under the joint programme at the partner higher education institution.

Please note that reports should not contain information which identifies any individual student.

Deadline: To be determined by your Faculty Deans or Head of Scientific Department

Programme:	
Report written by (include contributors):	
Academic Year	
Date of report:	
1. Actions from the previous year. Please report on progress with the actions you identified in last year's report.	

Guidance:

Your answer should refer to last year's report. If there are no actions on which to report, please explain why.

(500 words)

2. Institutional Priority: Student-Centred Teaching, Learning and Assessment and Research strategies

Please report on activities to align existing practice with the University's Teaching, Learning and Assessment and Research strategies.

Guidance for undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes:

Please report on activities to align existing practice with the University's Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy.

You should include how you have taken action to ensure that the University priorities, as set out in the strategy, are fully implemented. Answers to the following questions should be included:

- What changes have you made to programme and module learning outcomes to bring them in line with TSUL principles? What changes are still needed and what is the timeframe for these?

- What changes have you made to programme syllabi and teaching and learning materials to bring them in line with TSUL principles? What changes are still needed and what is the timeframe for these?

- What changes have you made to assessments to bring them in line with TSUL principles? What changes are still needed and what is the timeframe for these?

- What strategies do you have to ensure quality of feedback on assessed work? How do students rate your feedback?

Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

Guidance for Postgraduate Research Programmes:

Please report on activities to align existing practice with the University's strategic approach to research.

You should include how you have taken action to ensure that the University priorities are fully implemented. Answers to the following questions should be

included:

- How does the research programme contribute to disciplinary research priorities identified by TSUL?
- How does research output produced through the programme enhance institutional reputation for its research activity?
- Has research activity conducted as part of the programme helped to develop partnerships with external stakeholders?

(500 words)

3. Institutional Priority: Student Engagement

Please report on the approach and effectiveness of student engagement activities in line with the Student Engagement Policy.

Guidance:

You should include answers to the following questions:

- What opportunities do you provide to your students to enable them to feed into the learning and teaching process and how have you made students aware of these opportunities?
- What methods do you use to close the feedback loop to your students?

Your answer should include analysis of data from student surveys, programme and module evaluation and feedback expressed in Section-Students Committee and Faculty Student Committee meetings. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

4. Institutional Priority: Student Support

Please report on the effectiveness of student support arrangements.

Guidance for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes:

Your answer should include evidence of how your programme aligned with the University's new Student Support Policy, in terms of academic

guidance and student support.

Your answer should include analysis of data from student surveys, Section-students Committee and Faculty-student Committee meeting minutes, and programme feedback, including from programme and module evaluation. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

Guidance for Postgraduate Research Programmes:

Your answer should include evidence of the effectiveness of academic PGR student support arrangements (such as supervisor training, induction and training, annual reviews and for the doctoral thesis defence, support with career development/employability) and evidence of the approach to the wider PGR student experience (specifically in relation to community building and student satisfaction).

Your answer should include analysis of data from student surveys and committee meeting minutes. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

5. Student Outcomes

Please report on student assessment, progression and performance data for your programme.

Guidance for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes:

Your answer should include analysis of assessment, progression and degree outcomes on your programme and factors that might have impacted on them either positively or negatively.

Your answer should include specific analysis of any differences in attainment for different student demographic groups on your programme.

Your answer should include analysis of progression and performance data as well as student surveys, Section-students and Faculty-students Committee meeting minutes and programme and module evaluation. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

Guidance for Postgraduate Research Programmes:

Your answer should include analysis of outcomes of annual reviews, time to completion, completion rates and degree outcomes on your programme and factors that might have impacted on them either positively or negatively.

Your answer should include specific analysis of any differences in attainment for different student demographic groups on your programme.

Your answer should include analysis of progression and performance data as well as student surveys, committee meeting minutes and programme evaluation. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(500 words)

6. What has worked well this past year?

Please give specific examples of good practice for sharing across your Faculty and beyond.

Guidance:

Your answer should highlight particularly innovative or creative practice within your programme or where your approach and/or delivery has excelled in meeting requirements set out in new University policies and strategies.

(500 words)

7. What could have worked better/requires further development?

Please identify any areas for improvement as well as any challenges or barriers.

Guidance:

Your answer could include areas for further development within your programme or at Department, Faculty or University level.

(500 words)

8. Please use this free text space if there is anything you would like to reflect on or highlight that has not been addressed elsewhere in the report.

(500 words)

9. Actions for the coming year. Please identify actions you intend to take during the next year. For each action you **MUST** include: • a clear description of the action • the deadline • the individual or group responsible • a description of how you will assess its success • any resource requirements required to complete the action

For Bachelor's programmes

Dean	**signature**	**full name**
Head of Academic Department	**signature**	**full name**
Programme Pathway/Programme Leader	**signature**	**full name**

For Master's programmes

Director of the Higher School of Legal Research
signature **full name**

Head of the Department of Master's Programmes
signature **full name**

Programme Leader	**signature**	**full name**

For Postgraduate Research programmes

Director of the Higher School of Legal Research signature full name **Programme Leader signature full name**

Annex 2: TSUL Administrative Annual Monitoring Report Template

TSUL Administrative Annual Monitoring Report Template

Scope: All administrative departments, supporting the student experience, must be monitored annually and reports provided to the Department of Organizational Control and Strategic Planning in time to inform the development of an institutional summary that will be submitted to University Council.

Length: Your report should be concise (see word count guidance in each reporting box) and use bullet points where possible. The intention is that administrative departments identify the important and salient points needed to enhance the support provided to students, including identification of institutional and localized good practice and areas for development.

Data: Your report should include reflection on relevant data, such as: service usage and student demographic data. It should also consider quantitative and qualitative student satisfaction data. Where available, your report should consider the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) from the previous year. Where applicable it should also reflect on admission, progression, retention, attrition and withdrawal and graduate outcomes data as it relates to service usage. Specifically, you should comment on how any good practice has been disseminated and how are actions have been addressed.

Please note that reports should not contain information which identifies any individual student.

Deadline: To be determined by Department for Organizational Control and Strategic Planning

Department:	
Report written by (include contributors):	
Academic Year	
Date of report:	

1. Actions from the previous year.

Please report on progress with the actions you identified in last year's report.

Guidance:

Your answer should refer to last year's report. If there are no actions on which to report, please explain why.

(400 words)

2. Institutional Priority: Student Support Policy

Please report on activities to align existing practice with the University's Student Support Policy.

Guidance:

You should include how you have taken action to ensure that the University priorities, as set out in the strategy, are fully implemented. Answers to the following questions should be included:

- What changes have you made to your department to ensure activity aligns with the Student Support Policy? What changes are still needed and what is the timeframe for these?

- How is the work of your department contributing to improved outcomes for students? Please specify the outcomes in question and how you are evidencing your impact?

  Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(400 words)

3. Institutional Priority: Student Engagement

Please report on the approach and effectiveness of student engagement activities in line with the Student Engagement Strategy.

Guidance:

You should include answers to the following questions:

- What opportunities do you provide to your students to enable them to feed into student support and/or the University's administrative processes? How have you made students aware of these opportunities?

- What methods do you use to close the feedback loop to your students?

Your answer should include analysis of data from student surveys, programme and module evaluation and any relevant committees including Faculty Student Committees and the University Student Support Council. Where possible, compare this year's data with previous years' data.

(400 words)

4. Institutional Priority: Service to University Departments

Please report on how your administrative department has helped to provide effective service to University colleagues and other departments to enhance the overall student experience (e.g. provided training and development activities for colleagues, strengthened internal processes and systems etc).

Guidance

Your answer should highlight how you have worked with other colleagues to enhance the overall student experience (e.g. provided training and development activities for colleagues, strengthened internal processes and systems, collaborated on events or intiatives etc).

(400 words)

5. What has worked well this past year?

Please give specific examples of good practice for sharing across your Department and beyond.

Guidance:

Your answer should highlight particularly innovative or creative practice within your department or where your approach and/or practice has excelled in meeting requirements set out in new and existing University policies and strategies.

(400 words)

6. What could have worked better/requires further development?

Please identify any areas for improvement as well as any challenges or barriers.
Guidance: Your answer could include areas for further development within department or across the University. *(400 words)*

7. Please use this free text space if there is anything you would like to reflect on or highlight that has not been addressed elsewhere in the report. *(400 words)*

8. Actions for the coming year. Please identify actions you intend to take during the next year. For each action you **MUST** include: • a clear description of the action • the deadline • the individual or group responsible • a description of how you will assess its success • any resource requirements required to complete the action

Annex 3: Sample PRP visit Agenda

Times	Day 1
0830 - 0930	PRP arrival and meeting alone
0930 - 1030	**Meeting 1** with the leadership of the academic programme **Attendee list:**
1030 - 1100	PRP meeting alone
1100 - 1230	**Meeting 2** with academic teaching staff **Attendee list [no more than 10 staff]:**
1230 - 1330	PRP meeting alone and working lunch
1330 - 1430	**Meeting 3** with a representative group of students and alumni **Attendee list [no more than 12 students and alumni]:**
1430 - 1500	PRP meeting alone
1500 - 1600	**Meeting 4** with administrative staff providing support to the programme **Attendee list [no more than 10 staff]:**
1600 - 1615	Break
1615 - 1715	**Meeting 5** with external stakeholders **Attendee list [no more than 10 staff]:**
1715	Debrief with Programme Leadership
1730	Departure of the PRP

Lesson observations will also be conducted during the visit (where relevant).