Programme Review Transparency Statement

Introduction

Liverpool John Moores University utilises a combination of established processes and bespoke initiatives to assess and monitor the performance of its programmes. These mechanisms are transparent and enriched by the intersection of academic and professional service input and utilise a wide range of qualitative and quantitative data, derived from both internal and external sources.

The university's programme review mechanisms operate at strategic and decentralised levels, ensuring accountability and empowering informed action.

Programme and School Oversight

The university's primary programme review mechanism, Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement (CME), facilitates a real time review of its undergraduate and postgraduate-taught programmes, including those delivered by partner organisations. It is an evidence informed process that supports programme teams to continuously monitor standards and to identify appropriate, timely, measures that enhance the quality of students'[1] learning opportunities and outcomes.

The CME process is transparent and operates at module, programme and School-level, enabling core metrics to be analysed, which are made available in real time through a web-based application, alongside locally held qualitative and contextual information. The robust evidence base informs improvement strategies that are set out within a Reflection and Action Plan, which is used to record the timely management and resolution of identified actions. Reflection and Action Plans are produced at both programme and School-level.

Programme-level Reflection and Action Plans are maintained by programme teams, in an ongoing way, and progress is monitored by School Management Teams. Programme-level Reflection and Action Plans are also shared with students via Boards of Study.

In relation to School-level Reflection and Action Plans, these are monitored by Faculty Management Teams.

---

[1] The term student/students throughout this document may be replaced by apprentice/apprentices, where relevant.

The core dataset that informs CME comprises 6/7 key areas of programme performance, dependant on whether the award is undergraduate or postgraduate (associated threshold indicators are given in brackets, if applicable):

Module Statistics
- Pass rates at the first attempt and following referrals (89% and 92%, respectively).
- Mean mark (55% for undergraduate programmes and the pass mark plus 10% for postgraduate-taught programmes).
- Assessment component mean mark (50% for undergraduate programmes and the pass mark plus 10% for postgraduate-taught programmes).
- Module satisfaction score (Median of 2.5 or above).

Recruitment[2]
- Percentage of programme recruitment (against agreed programme targets).

Continuation[3]
- Students who are continuing study (or that have gained) a qualification one year and 15 days after they started their course for full-time or two years and 15 days for part-time (Programme Continuation Rate is flagged if it falls below either the OfS Subject Benchmark or the OfS Baseline).

Level Progression
- Proportion of students starting the programme on level 3 who progress to level 4 in the following term or within 2 terms for part-time.
- Proportion of students starting the programme on level 4 who progress to level 5 in the following term or within 2 terms for part-time.

Programme Completion on Time
- Completion on time (60% of full-time degree students should complete their target award within the expected time period).

Attainment[4]
- Good Honours (First-Degree graduates achieving a First or Upper Second-Class honours degree - Rate is flagged if it falls below the HEIDI Plus Subject Benchmark).
- Pass, merits, and distinctions for non-honours, including Masters programmes.

Student satisfaction
- The proportion of National Student Survey (NSS) respondents who respond favourably for each of the selected sections. (Rate is flagged if it falls below the most recently published TEF Subject Benchmark).
- Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) (77% for Assessment & Feedback, 76% for Engagement, 73% for Organisation & Management, 80% for Overall Satisfaction, 82% for Resources and 80% for Teaching & Learning).

---

[2] Demographic split metrics are also presented for this dataset.
[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid

Progression of Graduates[5]
- The proportion of Graduate Outcomes Survey respondents with positive outcomes (Rate is flagged if it falls below either the OfS Subject Benchmark or the OfS Baseline).

External Oversight

The university engages External Examiners to impartially, and independently, review and report upon the quality and standards of its undergraduate and postgraduate-taught programmes, confirming their alignment with applicable national standards, benchmarks, and frameworks.

External Examiners participate in the university's Boards of Examiners, which through consideration of quantitative data, review and monitor the performance of individual students, modules and programmes.

The operation of External Examining within the university is fully aligned with External Examining Principles agreed by the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assurance (UKSCQA).

The university also engages External Verifiers to support the review of its apprenticeship provision. External Verifiers complement the work of programme-level External Examiners by providing oversight of the performance and management of the university's apprenticeships, ensuring that they operate in-line with applicable internal and external policies, procedures and regulations.

External Examiners' and External Verifiers' judgements are informed through consideration of qualitative and quantitative data and professional interactions with applicable internal and external stakeholders.

Oversight of the work of External Examiners and External Verifiers is maintained by the university's External Examiner Panel, which is accountable to the university's Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC). Reports on the outputs of the university's External Examining and External Verifier mechanisms are presented to AQSC, annually.

External expertise are also engaged during the Periodic Programme Review process (see Institutional Oversight).

Programmes which are accredited/recognised/approved by a Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body (PSRB) are subject to the applicable body's review process. Oversight of this activity, including its outputs, is maintained by the university's PSRB Oversight Panel, on behalf of AQSC. A report on PSRB engagement is presented to AQSC on an annual basis.

Faculty Oversight

In addition to their responsibilities for overseeing School-level Reflection and Action Plans (see Programme and School Oversight), Faculties also receive intelligence arising out of School-level and institutional oversight of programme review. They also

---

[5] Ibid

monitor the financial stability of their provision based on factors such as applications, recruitment, cost margins, and sector benchmarking. Similarly, these are also used to identify opportunities for growth. Decisions to discontinue programmes on the part of Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellors, and university approval mechanisms, are cognisant of the requirements of the Office for Students (OfS) and the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), and the experience of any existing students must be safeguarded with a robust teach-out plan.

Institutional Oversight

The university's AQSC is accountable to the Academic Board for oversight of the operation and outputs of the CME process, seeking assurances with regard to the rigor and effectiveness of mechanisms in place to monitor and enhance the quality and standards of its taught programmes. Academic Board, and subsequently the Board of Governors, review the operation and outcomes of all quality assurance and monitoring activity via the Annual Academic Quality Report.

All undergraduate and postgraduate-taught programmes are subject to quinquennial review, via the university's Periodic Programme Review process. This process requires programmes to be considered by a panel of internal peers and external discipline experts, operating on behalf of the Academic Board, to verify the continued appropriateness of their quality and standards. The process facilitates longitudinal consideration of quantitative and qualitative data and contextual information.

The operation and outputs of the Periodic Programme Review process are monitored, on behalf of AQSC, by the Validation and Review Oversight Panel (VROP). AQSC, and subsequently the Academic Board, review the operation and outcomes of the Periodic Programme Review process through receipt of the Annual Validation and Review Report.

The governance structure of the institution instigates additional enhancement led project reports which secure contextual information on the value of courses to inform target setting and any necessary interventions. These include the analysis of qualitative comments and overall, Faculty, School and demographic quantitative performance in national student surveys (NSS and PTES) and institutional student survey outcomes, as well as overviews of school and subject Graduate Outcomes Survey performance against a range of key graduate employment benchmarking measures.

The committee structure oversees the development and evaluation of the university Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and statutory returns, such as the Access and Participation Plan Monitoring Return, which inform institutional transformative policies and procedures that shape its provision. They also commission and monitor the impact of bespoke projects to improve programmes and outcomes for students.