ANNUAL MONITORING OF TAUGHT AWARD OR CREDIT-BEARING PROVISION

CONTENTS

Outline of the procedure

1. Annual monitoring of taught credit-bearing modules and taught award or credit-bearing programmes has been designed to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and to meet the common and core practices for standards and quality. They also take account of a number of guiding principles set out within the accompanying Advice and Guidance sections.

2. The management and implementation of annual monitoring of taught credit-bearing modules and taught award or credit-bearing programmes is devolved to schools. The annual monitoring process has a learning and teaching focus.

3. At the end of each trimester of delivery, module leaders undertake a formal reflective evaluation of the delivery of taught credit-bearing modules.

4. At the end of each stage of study, programme leaders undertake a formal reflective evaluation of the delivery of taught award or credit-bearing programmes.

5. At the end of each academic session:

   a) all staff involved in the design and delivery of a module or programme are provided with a formal opportunity to engage in a subject group or school-level discussion on the effectiveness of learning and teaching delivery of taught award or credit-bearing provision

   b) Deans of Schools, or an appropriate individual nominated by them, undertake a formal reflective evaluation of the delivery of taught award or credit-bearing provision and the effectiveness of the module and programme monitoring process across the school in the form of an annual summary report to Quality & Standards Committee.

6. A Module Leader Evaluative Report template, Programme Leader Evaluative Report template, and a template for the School Annual Summary Report (all templates available from Quality Framework Section 2 Forms) have been developed as a means of helping to ensure that the monitoring process is implemented consistently University-wide. Each template is accompanied by guidance.

7. Evaluative reports and annual summary reports should focus on significant learning and teaching achievements, good or innovative practice, strengths or areas for future development. Descriptions of standard or expected practice need not be included. Commentaries should clearly identify and evaluate any potential risks to the quality or standard of the University's taught award or credit-bearing provision. Deans of School, or an appropriate individual nominated by them, have the right to refuse to accept a Module or Programme Evaluative Report if it includes insufficient detail or evidence of reflection on the delivery of taught provision.

8. Where an area for development has been identified, action taken or planned should be explained. The named lead individual responsible, typically the module or programme leader, a target date for taking the action to a full conclusion and the proposed methodology for evaluating the impact of each action should be included.

9. For reflection on the 2020/21 academic session, the Programme Leader Evaluative Report also includes an optional section to enable programme leaders to present practice aligned to the Gold Standard Curriculum enhancement framework, allowing potential early recognition against the Gold Standard Curriculum Framework.

10. Evaluative reports resulting from the module and programme monitoring process will form part of future Enhancement-led Institutional Review advance information sets. They may also inform other future internal or external audit, monitoring or review activity.

11. School support officers are responsible for maintaining accurate and complete records to demonstrate that all taught award or credit-bearing provision is monitored in accordance with this procedure.

Continuous reflection during the delivery period

12. Academic staff are encouraged to reflect and evaluate continually on the effectiveness of the learning, teaching and assessment methods throughout the delivery period. For example, though neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive:

    a) the continuing currency and validity of the taught credit-bearing module or award or credit-bearing programme in light of developments in research, professional and industry practice and pedagogy, including the use of technology in learning and teaching

    b) changes in the external environment such as requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies

    c) continued alignment with the school and University strategy and mission

    d) whether students are attaining the intended learning outcomes and whether the assessment regime enables this to be demonstrated appropriately

    e) where improvements are possible in order to enhance the student learning experience or to encourage the development of more inclusive approaches to learning, teaching and assessment

    f) ensuring that all students have an equal opportunity to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Formal reflection at the end of the delivery period

13.   The formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the taught credit-bearing module or award or credit-bearing programme delivery is informed by four sources of evidence:

   a)   student feedback gathered during the delivery period

   b)   feedback and comment from external examiners, academic peers and any other external professional, statutory or regulatory body

   c)   a centrally produced student achievement data set, available via Cognos

   d)   comments from internal peers who have contributed to teaching delivery.

14.   An indicative list of prompt questions relevant to each source of evidence has been developed to assist with the analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of taught award or credit-bearing provision delivery. The list of prompt questions is available from Quality Framework Section 2 Forms.

Discussing the outcome of the analysis and evaluation

15.   Programme Boards of Studies provide an appropriate forum to consider module and programme performance and matters arising from the learning, teaching and assessment approaches adopted by teaching teams.

The outcome of module and programme monitoring

16.   The outcome of the module and programme monitoring process is a completed evaluative report.

17.   In cases where the Board of Studies agrees that enhancement action is required before the next delivery of a taught credit-bearing module or a taught award or credit-bearing programme the module or programme leader will ensure that the evaluative reports provides the evidence to support the change process. Some amendments to programme and modules may require a longer lead-in time, in accordance with timeframes set out in Section 1b of the Quality Framework and this will need to be planned and managed within the Schools accordingly.

18.   Completed module and programme monitoring reflective commentaries are forwarded to the appropriate school support officer in accordance with local practice.

The school annual summary report

19. The school annual summary report is written by the Dean of School or an appropriate individual nominated by them. The report provides Quality & Standards Committee with the outcome of a formal evaluation of the delivery of taught award or credit-bearing provision and the effectiveness of the module and programme monitoring process across the school. The annual summary report and action plan is considered and approved by the School Learning, Teaching & Assessment Committee before being presented to Quality & Standards Committee, at the second meeting of the session, using the University template from the Quality Framework Section 2 Forms.

20. Completed school annual summary reports are forwarded to the appropriate school support officer in accordance with local practice. Appropriate school support officer will forward the report and action plan, with an appropriate covering paper, to the clerk to Quality & Standards Committee in accordance with published timescales.

Head of Subject involvement in annual monitoring

21. The variance in the role and remit of heads of subject in different schools led Quality & Standards Committee to agree that subject group leaders/Head of Subject are no longer required to complete a formal report as part of the annual monitoring process. Instead Deans of Schools, or an individual acting on their behalf, will ensure that all staff, including heads of subject, involved in the design and delivery of a module or programme are provided with a formal opportunity to engage in a subject group or school-level discussion on the effectiveness of learning and teaching delivery of taught award or credit-bearing provision.

22. Deans of Schools, or an individual acting on their behalf, will liaise with the Head of School Support to ensure that a formal record is kept of matters discussed during each subject or school-level monitoring meeting. The formal record will include an action plan recording identifying good or innovative practice, strengths and achievements or areas for enhancement using the standard University template.

Module leader prepares report and appends Cognos report

Informed by:
- Own reflections on progress made since last report (available on request from School Office)
- Data available from Cognos on module performance
- Feedback from students and other stakeholders

Programme Boards of Study should make effective use of the module leader and programme leader reports to support the effective management of the programme

School Quality Office/Staff

Programme leader prepares report and appends Cognos report

Informed by:
- Module reports of all modules contributing to the programme (available from School Office)
- Data available from Cognos on programme performance (which highlights strong modules and modules where there may be some concerns)
- Feedback from students and other stakeholders

Opportunity to:
- Share areas of good practice and areas for development arising from module and programme reports
- Highlight gaps where reports have not been submitted or do not provide sufficient detail to enable discussion of the effectiveness of learning and teaching delivery of provision.

School/Subject Group Meetings

School level report

Discussion at Quality & Standards Committee