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# Introduction

* 1. This code of practice sets out the University of Hull’s requirements for the annual monitoring, review and enhancement of *taught* programmes for collaborative provision.
  2. This Code is underpinned by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation (Nov 2018). It builds upon the premise that:

*“monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential process within providers, forming a fundamental part of the academic cycle… All higher education providers are involved in course monitoring and review processes as these enable providers to consider how learning opportunities for students may be improved.”.*

* 1. Annual Monitoring at the University of Hull provides opportunities for identifying areas for improvement and enhancement and promoting and sharing good practice. This is achieved by the effective and transparent use of a wide range of available data and evidence to inform improvement actions. The early identification of areas for improvement ensures the maintenance of academic standards and/or the enhancement of the quality of student learning opportunities and experience.
  2. Processes are informed by key student satisfaction and performance indicators as well as the views of external stakeholders, such as External Examiners and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).
  3. The Education Student Experience Committee (ESEC), on behalf of the University, manages the AMREP process and is responsible for the implementation of the AMREP Code of Practice.

# The Process of Annual Monitoring for Collaborative Provision

* 1. Annual Monitoring assumes a 3-step process:

1. **Module** Review (recommended as good practice);
2. **Programme** Review and Enhancement Report;
3. **Institutional** Review and Enhancement Report;
   1. Module and programme teams **should** make effective use of a range of sources of evidence when completing reports and action plans, these may include, but not be limited to:
4. Module Review and Evaluation;
5. Reports of external examiners;
6. Student survey results (e.g., internal Student Survey, National Student Survey (NSS). Including free text comments and key issues raised;
7. Data relating to recruitment and admissions, entry tariff, enrolment, assessment marks, progression, retention and achievement;
8. Graduate Outcomes results (where available);
9. Recommendations made at University Validation Panels;
10. Issues and good practice raised at Student Staff Forums;
11. If available, feedback from former students, staff, employers and professional bodies (PSRBs) as appropriate.
    1. Module and programme teams **should** reflect upon current and historical data to inform their analysis, thereby allowing the trends over time to be identified and context to data to be provided. This is particularly important when, for example, small cohort sizes are being discussed.
    2. Additionally, module and programme teams **should** consider how any relevant initiatives originating from University Committees can be or have been implemented. For example, how a change in university regulation or process may have impacted upon learning, teaching and assessment in the reporting year.

# Module Review and Evaluation

* 1. Whilst the University Code of Practice for Module Review (Standardised Module Review Process, Mid-Module Review and Module Evaluation Questionnaires) is not mandatory for Collaborative Partners, it is considered best practice and **should** be used as a guide for Partners to implement their own process of Module Review.
  2. Results from all relevant student feedback mechanisms **should** form part of the data available to module and programme leaders for completion of their annual report. It is considered good practice for module leaders to discuss the findings of module evaluations, critically reflecting on feedback provided by students and setting out any resulting actions that may, or may not, need to be taken as a result of feedback. This evaluation, it is suggested, **should** be made available to students thereby closing the feedback loop.

# Programme Review and Enhancement Report

* 1. The development of the Programme Report requires programme directors, programme management teams and the institution’s quality team to use the analysis provided in module reports to confirm explicitly whether academic standards are being maintained, in line with the UK Quality Code.
  2. The process of reviewing a programme encourages teams to identify areas of good practice where deliberate steps are being taken to improve provision and the student experience. The process also requires active consideration of quality indicators, such as student feedback, student outcomes and additional programme metrics. Analysis of all information **must** be detailed in the report, including how any issues are being responded to.
  3. Programme Reports include an additional section for Academic Contacts to complete, this section is to assure consistency of the student experience and academic standard, and to feedback on:

1. Assessment tasks and the standard of student performance;
2. Student attainment compared to that of students on comparable programmes;
3. Student support;
4. Strengths or areas of good practice worthy of wider dissemination.
   1. The final Programme Report **should** be submitted to the Quality Support Service. Reports **should** be received and discussed at the next trimester one Joint Board of Study meeting.

# Institutional Review and Enhancement Report

* 1. Partner institutions are required to complete an annual Institution Review and Enhancement Report, which collates findings from the module and programme reports and uses wider institutional data to evaluate the reporting year.
  2. The Institutional Review and Enhancement Report **should** be submitted to Quality Support Service who will be responsible for convening a panel to review the data, analysis and proposed actions included in the report.
  3. Review panels **must** be Chaired and Secretaried by the University and include academic representation from a university faculty. A panel may include a member of Professional Service Staff. It is deemed good practice for the panel to include a member from another partner institution.
  4. The panel **should** meet with the partner institution to verify or identify areas of good practice and for development and respond to any feedback or recommendations made to the University by the partner institution.
  5. Following the Review meeting, the Secretary will summarise the areas of good practice and areas for development identified by the panel and report these to the partner institution. A collated version of all partner institution findings will be reported to the Collaborative Provision Committee and Education Student Experience Committee.
  6. A summary of good practice identified within each partner institution report will be collated by QSS and circulated to all partner institutions via the Joint Development Board process.

# Action plans

* 1. The AMREP process promotes a prompt response and implementation of action plans at both programme and institutional level. This includes:

1. prompt referral of any issues requiring institutional action to the appropriate service area or University committee;
2. the early identification, recording and dissemination of good practice in a timely manner; and
3. the tracking of issues and improvement actions, so that stakeholders, including students, staff and external examiners are aware of such actions.
   1. In order to assure itself of the ongoing monitoring of actions, Quality Support Service may meet with partner institutions mid-way through the review cycle, to review actions arising from the review process.

**Version Control**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Author** | **Date approved** | **Relevant sections** |
| 2 00 | University Working Group - Nichola Cooper, Quality Manager CP, Quality Support Service | May 2023, Education Committee | Revisions include:   * Alignment to the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation. * Articulates the 3-step annual monitoring process more clearly, promoting the use of current and historical data to inform analysis and identifying areas for review and enhancement. * Clarifies requirements around module reporting process. * Confirms arrangements for the Institutional level report process and resulting summary report. * Replaces Education Committee with Education Student Experience Committee. |
| 1 02 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Jan 2022, housekeeping, | * Version 1 02 has been amended to make clear that the code is for collaborative provision only. On campus provision follows the University Code of Practice: Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE). Migrated to new template |
| 1 01 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Governance | Jan 2020, Housekeeping | Amendments to align to revised Code of Practice Standardised Module Review Process, Mid-Module Review and Module Evaluation Questionnaires. |
| 1 00 | Academic Data Manager, Learning, Teaching and Enhancement | Oct 2018, QSC | Changed name from Annual Monitoring and Review of Programmes (AMRP) to Annual Monitoring, Review and Enhancement of Programmes (AMREP) |